

HAROLD B. LEE LIBRARY
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
PROVO, UTAH



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Brigham Young University

45

GENESIS AN AUTHENTIC RECORD.

BS
1235.5
G 74x
vol. 1

THE BOOK OF GENESIS

TREATED AS AN
AUTHENTIC RECORD.

BY
THE REV. GEORGE GREENWOOD, M.A.,
Trinity College, Cambridge.

Editor of "LETTERS AND MEMOIR OF THE LATE JOHN WALTER LEA."

VOL. I.

PART I.
THE ADAMIC NARRATIVE.

PART II.
THE NOACHIC NARRATIVE.

Second Edition.

WITH A PREFACE ON DR. DRIVER'S WORK,
"THE BOOK OF GENESIS."

London:
THE CHURCH PRINTING COMPANY,
11, BURLEIGH STREET, STRAND, W.C.

All Rights Reserved.

A. H. BURTON, LTD., PRINTERS, CAXTON HOUSE,
LOUTH, Lincs.

HAROLD B. LEE LIBRARY
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
PROVO, UTAH

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

S. Augustine in his "De Genesi ad Litteram," Lib. viii., Cap. 1, says that there were some Christians in his day who insisted that "Genesis" was to be taken mystically. He, himself, however, declares categorically that "Genesis" is a history or narration of facts as much as the Book of Kings, although the facts admit of figurative or allegorical interpretation. This was also the view of Origen; and, speaking generally, all the great Fathers of the Church quote Genesis in such a way as proves that they regarded the statements of the earlier chapters, no less than the later, as narrating actual facts. On the other hand, probably ever since the Book of Genesis began to be thoughtfully studied, there have been, as there were in S. Augustine's time, some Christians who have insisted that the earlier chapters, at any rate, are to be taken figuratively or mythically, and are not to be depended upon as conveying literal truth. And the tendency so to regard the book has been intensified in our day both among believers and unbelievers by the difficulties which scientific discovery appeared to raise, and later still, by the discrepancies which the New German school of criticism considered that they found in the narrative.

But the further progress of scientific research has afforded the means of removing the difficulties which science raised. And the Higher Criticism, however much it has been wanting in the reverence and scrupulous care which such investigations from their very nature demand, has necessitated a minute examination of the words, the phrases, and the structure of Holy Scripture, which is likely in the end to lead to widely different conclusions from those which were at first arrived at.

I have endeavoured in the present work to apply modern scientific and critical methods to the interpretation of the first four chapters of the Book of Genesis; with the hope, if the result is found to be satisfactory, of extending my analysis to succeeding portions

of the book. My plan has been, assuming the literal truth of the narrative, to see what further facts, scientific, historical, or other, are implied in it; and to give the result in a sufficiently connected form to enable the reader to see all that it involves. In doing this, I have endeavoured to miss no clue, to evade no difficulty, to admit no inadequate solution; with what success, it is for others to judge. I cannot hope to have escaped all error; and the conclusions arrived at are often so unexpected, that, even if sound, they are sure to provoke some adverse criticism. But where I have failed myself, I trust that I may have done something towards pointing out the direction in which the truth is to be discovered, and may have helped others to complete what I have imperfectly begun.

I wish to express my obligations to B. T. A. Evetts, Esq., M.A., formerly of the Oriental Department of the British Museum,* for much kind counsel and assistance in preparing this work.

GEORGE GREENWOOD.

London, August, 1899.

* Author of "New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land," and of an annotated translation from the Arabic of the work by Abû Sâlih, entitled "Churches and Monasteries of Egypt."

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

It is now nearly five years since this book was first published. In the original Preface, which I have given above, and in the Introduction which will follow presently, I explained carefully the method and the principles on which I had proceeded in writing the work. During the time which has elapsed I have continued to apply those principles to the elucidation of a further portion of the Book of Genesis, and I have not found that they led me into any pitfall, or landed me in any absurdity. On the contrary, discoveries which have been made since then have confirmed what I wrote, especially as showing that the civilisation of mankind is to be traced, as the Scriptural narrative implies, to far earlier times than was then supposed, and in fact that the beginnings of it belonged to primitive man. Under these circumstances I should have been content, had matters remained as they were, to take little notice of the arguments and statements put forth by the Higher Critics, further than by pointing out here and there how completely they failed to explain the phenomena presented by the Book of Genesis. But the publication of Dr. Driver's work entitled "The Book of Genesis,"—intended apparently to popularise the destructive conclusions of the school of which he is the ablest representative in England, in nearly their most extreme form,—constrains me to adopt a different course.

Dr. Driver's work might very fairly be entitled "The Book of Genesis, treated as an Unauthentic Record," for there is scarcely an important statement contained in the Book which he will admit can be relied upon, or a single person mentioned whom he will allow to have certainly existed. Of the Biblical narrative of the Creation, Dr. Driver writes as follows:—"It possesses no claim . . . to describe even in popular language the process by which actually the universe was constituted in its present order, and the earth was gradually adapted to become the home of its wondrous succession of ever-progressing types of life."* Of

* Driver's "Genesis," p. xxxi., l. 5.

Paradise and the Fall he concludes that the Biblical account is "a legend respecting the first beginnings of man upon earth,—containing elements derived partly from Babylonia,—current in ancient Israel."* Of the Flood he speaks thus: "We are forced to the conclusion that the *Flood as described by the Biblical writers* is unhistorical."† Of the table of nations in the tenth chapter of Genesis he asserts that "it offers no historically true account of the *origin* of the races of mankind."‡ Of the Confusion of Tongues, Dr. Driver writes, "That the narrative can contain no . . . true account of the origin of different languages, is apparent."§ Of the Patriarchs he tells us, "The view which . . . may be said best to satisfy the circumstances of the case, is the view that the Patriarchs are historical persons, and that the accounts which we have of them are in *outline* historically true, but that their characters are idealized, and their biographies not unfrequently coloured by the feelings and associations of a later age,"|| That is to say, the Patriarchs probably are real persons, but we cannot depend on anything we are told about them being an actual fact.

The ordinary reader of the Bible, who is not highly critical, may be inclined to ask how it comes about that narratives which have been handed down as historically true are now in these latter days confidently treated as a collection of fictitious stories based on popular oral traditions? I will try to answer this question. In the first place a false presumption is taken to start with. The early history of nations generally has come down to us in the form of myth and legend. Why then, it is asked, should we suppose the primitive stories of the Israelitish people to be anything more certain? ¶ S. Paul gives the answer to this question in Romans iii. 1.

* Driver's "Genesis," p. 53, l. 21.

† Ibid, p. 101, l. 20.

‡ Ibid, p. 114, l. 10.

§ Ibid, p. 133, l. 16.

|| Ibid, p. lvii, l. 4 from the bottom.

¶ Ibid, p. lxvii., l. 4.

“What advantage,” he asks, “hath the Jew . . . ?” and he makes answer, “Much every way ; first of all, that *they were entrusted with the oracles of God.*” The revelation of God’s existence, His character, and dealings with mankind, was entrusted to the race from whom we have received the records contained in the Book of Genesis. Therefore there is a presumption, which exists in no other case, that those records have been preserved from misrepresentation and distortion.

Next it is objected that we have no contemporary corroboration of the events mentioned in Genesis.* The assumption implied in this argument is that we cannot depend upon the truth of any primitive record unless there be found some other record of the same period to corroborate it. I wonder how many of the early Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions would pass muster as true statements if they were tried by this test. Why is the Book of Genesis to be treated in a way which would destroy the credit of almost every primitive monument of antiquity ?

Again, it is alleged that the facts related in Genesis do not fulfil the condition which every good historical authority must satisfy, viz., that they were written by persons who lived sufficiently near the times in which the events spoken of are said to have occurred, to be able to ascertain the truth of what they recorded.† This argument would be a valid one if we were obliged to regard Moses as the author of the Book of Genesis. No doubt, Moses had in his hands the documents of which that Book is composed, and it is not at all impossible that he may have revised them, but many of the particulars are such that no one could have known of their occurrence except the persons who were the chief actors in them. Adam, Noah and Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph were in a position to record accurately the events related in Genesis. So that in fact, this argument against the authenticity of the Book in reality comes to this : first it is assumed that all the principal persons

* Driver’s “Genesis,” p. xlvihi., l. 5.

† Ibid, p. xlvihi.

mentioned in Genesis are more or less mythical, and then it is asserted that the Book cannot be true because there was nobody to record the truth.

But it must not be supposed that the Critics have no better arguments to rely upon than those which have been just mentioned. From the time when the science of geology began to reveal the successive stages by which the earth's surface attained its present condition there appeared to be discrepancies between the discoveries of that science and the Record of Creation, which perplexed those who believed that the latter was a true statement of what God had done. Attempts were made one after another to get over the difficulty, which were none of them successful, and in fact only increased the bewilderment of the cultivated believer. Dr. Driver has given a full account of these attempts, and has fairly stated the objections which are fatal to them all in pp. 19 to 26 of his *Excursus* on "The Cosmogony of Genesis."

But he—no less than the later apologists for the creation narrative whom he criticises—appears not to have perceived that the firm establishment of the principle of Development has entirely altered the question. The meaning of any account of Creation must depend entirely on the meaning of Creation itself. If then, the theory of Evolution is a part of God's truth, and if the narrative in the 1st Chapter of Genesis is a partial description from God Himself of the method and order of Creation, it necessarily follows that this account could not be understood, until the doctrine of Evolution had explained the true idea of Creation. It had to be accepted as a matter of faith to be elucidated in due time. Therefore it was that I began this volume with an attempt to define Creation from the standing-point of Evolution, and I think that if my readers will do me the honour to read carefully my first two chapters, they will find that, when thus viewed, all the difficulties and objections disappear of themselves, or are easily removed.

As Dr. Driver goes on, he mentions other scientific objections to the Book of Genesis, besides those which seemed to arise from the narrative contained in the

1st Chapter. Several of these appear to be too trivial or uncertain to be worth noticing, but those which result from the variety of races, and the multitude of languages, belonging to the human family, the reader will find carefully discussed, and I hope fully removed in Appendix L, at the end of this volume.

But if the Critics will not allow that the Book of Genesis was written by persons who knew the truth of what they related, it may naturally be asked, what account do they themselves render of the origin of the documents of which the Book is composed? I will try to give the answer to this question as it is set forth by Dr. Driver. He informs us, that first of all a writer who is called J.—because it is supposed that he used “Jehovah” in preference to any other name of God,—and who wrote in the 9th century, B.C., and another writer who is called E.—because he is supposed to have used the word “Elohim” rather than Jehovah to denote the Deity,—and who wrote in the 8th century, B.C., composed two independent narratives of the Patriarchal age. These narratives both took as their basis popular stories and traditions existing in their time, and apparently had nothing more solid to rest upon.

Two centuries later, about the time of Ezekiel and the Exile, another writer or school of writers, which is called P., compiled a narrative containing a systematic account of the various ceremonial institutions of the Hebrews, such as the Sabbath, Circumcision, Sacrifices, etc., etc., a part of which is incorporated in the Book of Genesis, and in fact forms the framework of that Book. This narrative had a far less groundwork of popular tradition, and indeed appears to have gone upon the plan of taking some institution existing in the time of the writers, and giving an imaginary account of its origin. For instance, they found the observance of the Sabbath practised, and invented the idea of God having rested from the work of Creation on the seventh day as an explanation of it. Thus Dr. Driver says—“The narratives of P. we shall hardly be wrong in regarding, even in details, as far more the author’s own creation than those of J. or E.”*

* Driver’s “Genesis,” p. lxi, l. 3.

But even the popular stories of J. and E. are what he describes as "idealized,"* which means in plain English that the writers added to the beauty, interest, and religious teaching, of the stories they related by inserting fictions of their own, to make them better vehicles of their ideas, and of the lessons which they wished to convey.

Thus it appears that, in addition to the uncertainties of popular tradition as existing hundreds of years after the times of the events of which it preserves some sort of memory, there is, according to the Critics, another element of fiction, introduced intentionally by the narrators to serve their own purposes.

Finally, the Book of Genesis was formed by a compiler who combined J., E. and P., P. being the framework into which portions of the other two documents were inserted in such a way as to make a tolerably consistent whole.

The first remark that may be made on this theory of the origin of Genesis is, that there is not the smallest evidence of any one of these authors having ever existed, except such as may arise from differences of style and wording found in different parts of the book, which are attempted to be accounted for in this way. Undoubtedly such differences do exist, but they admit of a far more simple and natural explanation. We may very rightly suppose that the principal persons by His dealings with whom the Almighty chose to manifest Himself in due time to the whole human race, knowing that what befel them had an interest not merely for themselves but for all mankind, kept records of the principal events of their own lives; and that the documents containing these records were finally put together to form the Book of Genesis.

But supposing, for the sake of argument, that J., E., and P. did really exist, and write the several parts of the Book which are attributed to them, what are we to say as to the mental attitude of the men who acted in this manner? Dr. Driver tells us that the writers of "the first eleven chapters of the Book of Genesis report faithfully what was currently believed among the

* Driver's "Genesis," p. lxi, l. 9 from bottom.

Hebrews respecting the early history of mankind.”* Again, he quotes Mr. Ottley as saying with regard to the history of the Patriarchs, “We have here to do with . . . traditional folk-lore about primitive personages and events, worked up according to some preconceived design by a devout literary artist :” which Dr. Driver puts into his own language by saying, “The basis of the narratives in Genesis is in fact popular *oral tradition*.”†

Here, then, comes in the question as to the good faith of these supposed writers. If J., E., and P. wrote the Book of Genesis, they must have been all of them well-educated, well-informed, and able literary men. Now can it be supposed that such men were unaware that popular tradition could not be depended upon, and that its statements were often grossly inaccurate? and if so, with what intention did they take them as the basis of their narratives? Again, they could not suppose that their own “idealizing” represented facts as they really were. Thus it cannot be doubted that they were well aware that they were setting down as history a great deal of what they knew to be fiction. Could this be done in good faith? That must depend on the character in which they published these writings. If they were put forth ostensibly as novelettes with a purpose, well and good, but then how did they come to be accepted by the Jewish Church as authentic sacred history? On the other hand, if they did not make known their real character, but published them as an actual record of facts, surely we must pronounce them to be guilty of a pious fraud, and look upon the Book of Genesis as an imposition. Dr. Driver seems to suppose that he gets over this difficulty by speaking of these men as “inspired,” and pointing out that their work is “suffused with pure and ennobling spiritual ideas.”‡ It is true that a work of fiction may be full of pure and ennobling ideas, and if the writer puts it forth as a work of fiction,

* Driver’s “Genesis,” p. xlii., l. 8 from the bottom.

† Ibid, p. lviii., lines 6-9.

‡ Ibid, p. lxxiii., line 9.

those ideas may render it exceedingly valuable. But what is to be thought of a man who publishes a work of fiction, as containing veritable sacred history, and supposes that he may be excused in doing so because he has made it the vehicle of sound moral and religious teaching ?

And consider the question on the side of inspiration. Dr. Driver reiterates the oft-repeated fallacy that the Church has never formulated a definition of inspiration ;* as if nothing could be apprehended until it was expressed in a formal verbal definition. The *sensus communis* of Christians throughout the ages is clear enough to enable us to judge of a new theory of inspiration ; and what does it say to the following account of it ? According to the view propounded by Dr. Driver, we have the God of truth, Who knows with absolute certainty what His dealings with mankind actually were from the beginning, and Who therefore could well cause a faithful record of those dealings —so far as He wished them to be known to all mankind, —to be written down accurately, and transmitted safely through the ages, choosing rather to inspire a very clever pious fraud, producing a mass of religious fiction, to be the vehicle of His revelation of Himself. The idea would be so grotesque as to provoke a smile, if it were not that it barely escaped the condemnation of presumptuous irreverence.

I have no intention of examining the criteria alleged by the discoverers of J., E., and P. as enabling them to distinguish the portions of the Book of Genesis which may be attributed to each of these several writers ; it would be necessary to write a treatise to do this adequately. I hope that sooner or later some competent scholar will take this task in hand, and by sifting thoroughly the assumptions and methods made use of by the Critics, and applying them to other writings, show unmistakably that no certain conclusion can be established by them, except how possible it is for learned men and eminent scholars to deceive themselves laboriously. In the meantime, ordinary Christian readers of the Bible may be reassured by

* Ibid, p. lxiii., line 2 from the bottom to p. lxiv., line 2.

seeing how such teaching leads to irreverent absurdity, and may judge of the methods by their fruits.

It only remains to show what is the effect of such doctrines upon religious belief so far as they are accepted. Dr. Driver affirms "that the religious value of the narratives of Genesis . . . remains *essentially unchanged*":* let us see whether this is really the case.

In the first place, this teaching destroys *all the authority* of the Book of Genesis as a source of religious truth. I think that Dr. Driver will hardly deny this, and I wish I could feel certain that he will regret his inability to deny it. It is quite clear that a collection of religious novelettes, however good may be the lessons which they are intended to convey, cannot enforce them with any authority. If they set forth truths which the reader has already accepted, or which are agreeable to him though he has not accepted them before, they may produce a good impression; but if they make statements, or lay down rules which are not agreeable to him, he is under no obligation to receive them. Dr. Driver may suppose that this difficulty is got over by his assertion that these religious romances were Divinely inspired, but how are we to discover what part of them is Divine truth, and what is merely well-meant fiction? If it be said that whatever religious and spiritual teaching they convey carries with it Divine authority, but that whatever statements with regard to science and history they contain cannot be depended upon, the answer is that it is impossible to make a distinction of this kind. Take for instance the very first sentence of the Book of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." This, I suppose, Dr. Driver would say was an inspired statement, to which full authority must be attributed. "No," exclaims some scientific man who is an atheist, "it is a scientific statement, and, if true, it is the fundamental truth of science; for it is an attempt to explain the origin of everything that science has to deal with. So far then from carrying any authority with it,

* Driver's "Genesis," p. lxviii., l. 18 from the bottom.

it is one of the popular myths which P. has made the groundwork of his story, or one of the 'idealisms' which he has imagined for himself; and I am much obliged to Dr. Driver for giving me such a good explanation of it." And the ordinary reader, who has, perhaps, become perplexed in his belief by all the scepticism which he hears, may say, "How can I receive the great truth, if it be a truth, that God created the heaven and the earth, on the authority of a Book which immediately goes on to tell me the great untruth, if it be untrue, that He made them in six days." And so with all the important statements of the Book of Genesis: Divine Creation, The Making of Man in the Image of God, The Hallowing of the Seventh Day's Rest, The Giving of the Life-long Union of one Man with one Woman as the true Ideal of Marriage, The Marring of God's Image in Man by the Fall, The Divine Vengeance on a Race steeped in Corruption, The Command that Human Vengeance shall be executed on the Wilful Murderer, all these and many other truths, together with the obligations which they impose, lose their authority at once if the teaching of the Higher Criticism be accepted. I think Dr. Driver must allow this in the case of the Book of Genesis, and all other Books of the Bible that are treated in the same way.

And not only does Holy Scripture lose its sanction and authority under such treatment, but all Church authority also is shaken to its foundations. What shall we say of the ancient Jewish Church, which was entrusted with the safe-keeping of the oracles of God, if it easily accepted, without due investigation, a collection of religious romances, and handed them down with no indication of their real character; as veritable Sacred history? And the sad dereliction of duty does not end there; for what shall we say of the Christian Church, filled with the plenitude of the Holy Ghost, appointed to "be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ,"* if it was unable to discern the great mistake which had been made, or if it did, uttered no

* Articles of Religion, XX. "Of the Authority of the Church."

warning. How did it in that case prove itself as “ the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth ? ” If this were so, how could we appeal any longer to the authority of the Church in any question of interpretation, or for the handing down of any religious truth ?

Nay, can we stop here, although it seems almost an act of profanity to go on ? What are we to think of the Great Head of the Church Himself, the very Word of God, through Whom the Scriptures were given, Who *quoted them as authoritative*, Who opened the minds of His disciples that they might understand them, and thus set the Church in that line of exposition in which it has gone on treading ever since, if He did not know Himself, or concealed from them the knowledge, that a large portion of Holy Scripture was little better than a collection of fables ?

Surely those who accept and hand on theories which involve such consequences as these, religious and earnest though they may be, know not what they do. However much they may fail to perceive the fact themselves, or may try to conceal it from others, they are destroying all confidence in the charts which would enable men to steer safely through difficult and dangerous seas, they are fouling the wells of salvation so that men shun to drink thereof.

I have written confidently, because I feel confident, but I am aware that such a feeling is no infallible proof that I am right. And when I see how many learned and eminent men, how many earnest and devout teachers, have embraced wholly or in part views which appear to me unsettling to the spirit, and disastrous to the faith, I dare not hide from myself the possibility that it is I myself who may be in error. But the controversy is one which immediately concerns the honour of the One True God, and of Jesus Christ Whom He has sent. Therefore I feel no anxiety about the result, but can thankfully say, “ God is Judge Himself ” ; “ *Dies declarabit.* ”

GEORGE GREENWOOD.

Sidmouth, June 3, 1904.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. - - - - - p. 31

Main Object of Bible—Word “Elohim”—Definition of “Creation”—Creation in Genesis Implies Previous Creative Acts—State of Things then Existing—Meaning of Word rendered “The Deep” in English Versions—Scientific Facts Implied—Transition to a Different Condition—Appearance and Action of “the Spirit of God”—Meaning of Word “Ruach”—“Let there be Light,” to Whom Addressed, and Why—Its Fulfilment, and What It Implied—God’s Delight in His Creation—Separation of Light from Darkness, Why Needed, and How Effected—Terms “Day” and “Night”—“A Day” Signified What It Does Now—Creation of an “Expanse” to Divide the Waters, What It Meant—Meanings of “Rāqia’” and “Shamayim”—Atmosphere, How Created; Not Constituted at Once as Now—Separation of Land and Water, How Effected—Words for “Earth” and “Sea” Received Fresh Significations—God’s satisfaction with His Work—Creation of “Grass,” “Herb,” and “Fruit-tree”—What Then Created—All Vegetable Life Developed From It—This Creative Act Probably Confined to the Earth—Meaning of Words “It was so”—Creation and Purpose of “Sources of Light”—Condition of Solar System at That Time—Imperfect Division of Day and Night—Condition of Moon—How the Present State of Things Produced—Nature of the New Energy Unknown—How Sun and Moon are “for Signs and for Seasons”—Stars made at the Same Time—Creation of Marine Animals, and of Birds, Probably Two Distinct Acts—Reasons for Supposing that the Germ of Marine Life was Derived from a Vegetable Germ already Existing—New Capacity Introduced, that of Sensation—The Germ of Bird Life Derived from that of Fish Life—Perhaps by Transition from Cold Blood to Warm—Blessing of the Living Creatures, What it Meant—Reasons for Supposing some Malign Influence has Interfered with Orderly Development—Such Interference Permitted for Good Ends—Creation of Terrestrial Animals, Probably from a Bird Germ—Perhaps by Transition from Oviparous Animals to Mammalia—“Let Us Make Man,” not Addressed to Angels—Implies Creation of a Race, not of an Individual—

Distinction between "Image" and "Likeness"—Justification of a True "Anthropomorphism"—Found in a Narrative Asserted to be Less Anthropomorphic than other Parts of Scripture—Dominion Given to Man—What was then Created—Distinction of Sex Constituted from First—Both Made in Image of God—Right Given to Man to Alter the Crust of the Earth—All Vegetable Productions, Food for Man and Beast—"And it was so" does not imply that Everything was Produced at Once in Visible Material Existence—Question as to God's Complete Satisfaction with His Creation.

CHAPTER II. - - - - - p. 63

V. 1-3, properly the Conclusion of Preceding Narrative—No Suggestion of Fatigue in God—Hallowing of the Seventh Day Intended Primarily for the Dwellers in Heaven—Work of Creation Never Resumed Hitherto, Except in the Resurrection—Scientific Enunciation of this Fact—Institution of Sabbath Marks Importance of Six Days' Work—Heavenly Sabbaths Regulated by Earthly Days—Paramount Importance of Man's Earth in Universe—Yet Earth not Physically Conspicuous—Pope Urban VIII. and Galileo—Mistake of Supposing that Spiritual Greatness Implies Material Magnitude—Yet Dr. Whewell Probably Right in Asserting Uniqueness of Earth—And Earth may be Destined to Appear Finally as Physical Centre of Universe—Record of Creation Worthy of, and Must Have Proceeded from, Divine Author—Not Impaired in Transmission—Incredible that It Could Have Been Fabricated—Meaning and Origin of Phrase "These are the Generations of"—Editor had Record of Creation, and Prefixed This Summary to Succeeding Narrative—Difficulty from Introduction of Word "Jehovah"—Name Unknown till Revealed to Moses—Must Have Been Inserted in Genesis or Substituted for Some Other Title—Inserter Wished to Show that the God of Creation was the God of Israel—Immense Lapse of Time between Period of v. 4 and that of v. 5—Geological Ages Have Passed, bringing Development of Plant and Animal—Latter has terminated in a Creature Not Differing Outwardly from Man—Veil Raised Again to Disclose Unexpected Scene—Partial Absence of Vegetation—Meaning of Hebrew Words "Syach" and "Sadeh"—Reasons for Delay of Final Development of Certain Trees and Plants, Want of Rain, and of Cultivation—Suggested Cause of Drought—Its Termination—Formation of Adam—Erroneous Idea—Truth Contained in It—Meaning of

"Adam"—Terms Used Describe Formation of Every Child—Represent What Really Takes Place—"Man Became a Living Soul"—Child has no Consciousness Till It Breathes—"Living Soul" Expresses Nothing Peculiar to Man—Human Prerogatives First Appear Several Years After Birth—Line of Man's Development Watched and Guarded—Description of his Immediate Ancestors—What Led to Their Almost Total Extermination—How a Single Pair may have Survived—Circumstances of Birth of Man made in Image of God—How Long Left With His Parents—What Sort of Child, Whither Taken, and How Trained—Training Lasted Probably at Least One Hundred Years—Place Prepared on Earth—Description of Paradise—Situated in "Eden"—There God "Put the Man Whom He Had Formed"—Occasion of Joy and Anxiety—Attention Called to Word "Eastward" in v. 8—Inserted Later By One Who Dwelt Far To West of Eden—Other Reasons for Believing the Description of the Locality Was Added Long After—Four "Heads" of the River of Paradise, Where To Be Found—Name of First Head, "Pison," Lost—Identification of Land of "Havilah" Which It Encompassed—Productions of Havilah—Present Inhabitants—Meaning of "Bedolach" and Localities in Which Found—Second River "Gihon" to be Identified With the Choaspes—Described as Compassing "The Whole Land of Cush"—This Defines the Country of Cush Here—Third River, "Hiddekel," *i.e.*, the Tigris—Described as Running "East of Assyria"—This Defines the Country of Assyria Here—Fourth River, "Euphrates"—Why No Description Needed—Difficulty Stated, and Answered—"Tree of Life"—Its Purpose, to Preserve Bodily Life—Inference that Body was Liable to Natural Decay—"Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil"—Shows Man Never Hitherto Tempted, now His Probation to Begin—Paradise the Starting-point from which the Whole Earth Was To Be Redeemed from the Enemy—Its Master Must Learn to be Firm in Faith and Obedience—Revelation of God as a Ruler Demanding Obedience and Inflicting Penalties—Man Starts as a Settled Tiller of the Ground—Tree of Knowledge Not Remarkable in Itself—Did Not Inflict Bodily Death—Test of Faith and Obedience—Death Resulting from Eating, Destruction of Free-will—Adam's Need of Companionship—Appearance of Animals Associated with Man—In What Sense "Formed Out of the Ground"—Not Created Then—Brought to Adam to Name—Inference as to Origin of Language—No Suitable Companion Found

Among Them—Birth of Woman, not Creation—Operation of Divine Surgery—Female Element Latent in Man—Perfect Woman Produced—Man's Longings Satisfied—Woman at First Needed Informing and Guiding—Adam's First Words On Seeing Her—Had Seen In Trance How She was Produced—Meaning of Hebrew Word "Ish" and "Ishsha"—Adam Had Been Taught About Human Relationships—Connection of Man and Wife Closer Than Any Other—Needed No Clothing—Naked, and Not Ashamed—Erroneous Idea of Two Inconsistent Accounts of Creation in Genesis—No Creation Described in 2nd Chapter, But a Totally Different Process Expressed in Different Words—Whether Account of It Invented About 750 B.C., Reader can Judge.

CHAPTER III. - - - - - p. 100

Probable course of Human Progress if all had gone well—Divine Purpose Hampered by Man's Defection—The Sagacity of Serpent, observed by Man, and made use of by Satan—Eve's Inexperience exposed her to his Attack—Curiosity Drew her to Tree of Knowledge—Serpent Impelled by Satan to do his Bidding—Why Eve not Startled—Dialogue between Serpent and Eve—Insertion of Name "Jehovah" Dropped—Distrust of God in Eve—Motives at Work in her Mind—Took of Fruit and Ate—Fallaciousness of Sin—Eve Hastens to Tell her Husband—Succeeds in Seducing Him—His Sin far more Fatal—Effect of It—"They knew that they were Naked"—For a Time the Guilty Ones Left to Themselves—Exultation Succeeded by Foreboding—Voice of God Heard—Adam and Eve Constrained to Stand before Judge—Adam's Excuse—Inculcates Eve—She Throws Blame on Serpent—God's Sentence on Serpent—Entirely Aimed at Satan—Import of it, Utter Disappointment and Degradation—Then Wonderful Announcement—Woman to be Protagonist Against Evil One—Meaning of "Her Seed" and "Thy Seed"—Explanation of "It Shall Crush Thy Head, and Thou Shalt Crush His Heel"—Sentence on the Woman: Suffering Peculiar to her Sex, Subjection to Control of her Husband—Sentence on Man: Lifelong Toil, Final Return to Dust—Meaning of a Curse being Laid on Anything.—Satan Himself Made Instrument of Carrying Out Sentences he had Drawn Down—Significance of Name "Eve"—Implies Origin of Mankind from a Single Centre—Clothing of Adam and Eve—Whence Supplied—Its Spiritual Significance—Expulsion from Paradise—Why Necessary—Lingering of Adam and Eve—Re-entrance Barred—"Cherubim": What their Presence Implied—

"Flame of a Sword," What this may have been—Tree of Life Guarded, Not Taken Away—Man not Cast Off—Satan had Failed to Work His Utter Ruin—Second and Third Chapters of Genesis, Originally Formed One Document—Adam Must Have Been the Author—The Account Not Originally Written—Learnt by Heart—Handed Down by Unvarying Oral Tradition.

CHAPTER IV. - - - - - p. 117

Life in Paradise Not Wasted—Man Not Sent Forth Empty-Handed—Climate and Soil of Adjacent Country Good—New Life Not Excessively Toilsome—First Birth—Why Process of Generation Described—Signification of Name "Cain"—Some Years Intervened Before Birth of "Abel"—Significance of Name—Occupation of the Two Sons—Their Offerings to God—Both Legitimate in Themselves—Name "Jehovah" Here used by Itself—What Indicated by This—Substituted for "El"—Meaning of "El"—Substitution not Always Harmless—This Sacrifice not the First Act of Worship—Cain's Offering Rejected—Why—His Fierce Anger—God's Remonstrance—Explanation of Terms—Cain not to Forfeit his Authority as Elder Brother—Tells his Brother Part of the Message—Slays Abel, and Hides the Corpse—God's Inquisition and Sentence on Bloodshed—Still Fulfilled—Why Not Heavier—Need That He Should Depart—Signs of Penitence—Dread of Vengeance—Assurance of Protection—His Departure not Solitary or Without Resources—Whither—Meaning of Word "Nod"—Inference to be Drawn—Birth of Cain's First Son—Meaning of his Name—City Called After Him—His Son "Irada"—Meaning of Name Uncertain—Irada's Son "Mehujael"—Significance of Name—Birth of Methujael—Significance of Name—Birth of Lamech—Meaning of Name—Marries Two Wives—Beginning of Polygamy—Meaning of Names "Adah" and "Zillah"—Birth of "Jabal"—Meaning of Name—Organizer of Nomadic Life—Birth of "Jubal"—Meaning of Name—Inventor of Music—Birth of "Tubal-Cain"—Significance of Name—Inventor of Cutting Tools—Meaning of Word "Nechsheth"—End of Neolithic Age—Birth of "Naamah"—Meaning of Name—Mention of Women's Names Remarkable—Probable Reasons—Misadventure of Lamech—His Apologetic Account—First Recorded Rhythmical Composition—Structure of Eastern Poetry—Origin and Meaning of Lamech's Apology—Birth of "Seth"—Significance of Name—Birth of "Enosh"—Meaning of Name—"Then Began Men to Call Upon the Name

of (Jehovah) "—These Words Meaningless—"Jehovah" Substituted for "El"—Signification of "El"—Confirmation of This Explanation of Passage—Enables us to Date Birth of Mechujael—Probabilities as to Authorship of Genesis IV.—Inference Thence Arising with Respect to Approximate Chronology of the Period.

CHAPTER V. - - - - - p. 141

Progress Made by Mankind, Temporal and Spiritual—To End in a Catastrophe—"This is the Book"—First Indication of Writing—Adam not Taught the Art of Writing—How that Art Originated—Reference to Genesis i. 27, 28, Shows that Author of Present Chapter had the Record of Creation—"Adam Lived Two Hundred and Thirty Years"—This the Reading of Septuagint—Difference Between This and Hebrew—Why Former Preferred—"And Begat a Son in His Own Likeness"—Therefore in Likeness of God, but Disfigured—"He Begat . . . Daughters"—This, the First Mention of Daughters—Their Existence Implied—Age of Adam at Death—Age at Birth of First Son, and at Death, of Seth and Enosh—Meaning of Name "Kenan"—His Age at Birth of "Mahalalel"—Significance of this Name—Kenan's Age at Death—Age of Mahalalel at Birth of "Jared"—Unmeaning Name—Mahalalel's Death—Age of Jared at Birth of Enoch—Death of Jared—Age of Enoch at Birth of "Methuselah"—Usual Interpretation of this Name seems Senseless—Another Suggested—"Enoch Walked with The God"—Significance of This—Translation of Enoch—Significance of "The God"—Mention of False Gods Avoided—Age of Methuselah at Birth of Lamech—Death of Methuselah—Age of Lamech at Birth of "Noah"—Significance of this Name—Death of Lamech—"Son of Five Hundred Years"—Meaning Suggested—Noah's Three Sons—Age of Noah at Birth of "Shem"—Probable Date and Order of Birth of "Ham" and "Japheth"—Meaning of Names—How the Genealogical Records in this Chapter Preserved—Probably Some Mode of Writing Invented by this Time.

CHAPTER VI. - - - - - p. 154

"When Men Began to Multiply"—Probable Date of Establishment of Idolatry—Hence Indication of Time of Intermingling of Two Diverse Races—Meaning of "Sons of God"—S. Augustine's View Founded on Error—Difficulty Arising from Christ's Words—Angels in Normal Condition Incapable of Marriage—These had Left Their Original Condition—Angels,

Except in Vision, Appear in Body of Man and Clothed—Reason Why Word “Angel” Not Used Here—How Angels Came to See Daughters of Men—Their Appreciation of Earthly Beauty—Connections They Formed Not Temporary—Reason of This—Shows Great Attractiveness of the Women—Why No Reluctance on Part of Latter—Yet Probably Fierce Anger on Part of Men—Hence Increase of Strife and Contention—V. 3 Out of Its Place—Transposition Not Infrequent—Giants in “Those Days”—What Time Denoted—Intermingling of Diverse Races Produced Monstrous Progeny—Rise of Mighty Conquerors—This Account Written Long After—The Wickedness of Man—The Divine Regret—Announcement that End Coming—Limit of Time Fixed—Reasons for Delay—Thoroughness of the Destruction—To Whom Announced—Effect on Tenor of Noah’s Life—“Annals of Noah,” Heading of Separate Document—Probably by Same Author as Previous One—Noah Blameless in his Generations—Meaning of This—Same Expression Used of Him as of Enoch—Force of It—Could He Have Written These Things About Himself?—Birth of Noah’s Three Sons—Brings Time to about Eighty Years before Deluge—Increased Corruption—Probably All Drawn Into It but Noah’s Immediate Ancestors and Descendants—Doom of Mankind Announced for Second Time—Form It Would Take Now Indicated—Noah Directed to Construct Ark—Nature of This—Its Material and Coating—Its Dimensions—Size Compared with Ships Now Built—To Have a “Light”—What This Was—Door and Decks—How Arranged—Covering of Ark—Flood Plainly Declared—Noah and his Family to be Saved—And a Selection of Animals—To be Collected by Noah’s Own Exertions—So the Food Necessary—How Provision Made for Carnivora—Preparations Begun by Noah and his Children Probably Fifty Years before Flood—What Had To Be Done—Included Warning the World and Calling to Repentance—All Fully Accomplished.

CHAPTER VII. - - - - - p. 175

Lapse of Fifty Years—How Occupied—Final Directions—Reason of Renewed Declaration of Noah’s Righteousness—Enumeration of Animals to be Taken—How and Why It Differs From That Given Fifty Years Before—Distinction between “Clean” and “Unclean” Animals—How Originated—Week Allowed for Embarkation—what Noah would take on Board—Especially the Sacred Records—Preparations Completed—Age and Experience of Noah—Enumeration of Inmates of

Ark—Why Given—Orderly Entrance and Locating of Animals—Inference from mention of Period of Seven Days—Meaning of Designation of Time—Kalendar then in Use—Difference of Ten Days as to Commencement of Flood—Date A.M.—Description of Phenomena of Flood—No Account of the Causes in Divine Utterances—Condition of Atmosphere while Cataclysm Lasted—Probably over Limited Area—The Hebrew does not imply Submersion of Whole Globe—Mistake of English Versions as to Time when Noah's Family entered Ark—Final Enumeration of Animals taken into Ark—Explanation of Terms—Point of this Enumeration—God Shut Them In—Arrangement of Inmates of Ark—Number of Species compared with those in Regent's Park Zoological Gardens—Universal Flood must have Destroyed many Species—Question whether Those now Existing could have been Developed since Flood—Such Supposition Improbable—Extent of Area Submerged—Probability as to Exact Nature of Catastrophe—Water continued to rise for Forty Days—Probable Rainfall—Would Cause a Thick Layer of Fresh Water above the Salt—Effects of this—State of Mind of Those outside of Ark—Beginning of Cataclysm—Quiet Progress of Ark—Description of an Eye-witness—Gradual Submergence of Mountain Ranges—Depth of Water above Them—All Life Destroyed probably in Twenty-four Hours—Estimate of Number of Human Beings who Perished—And of Area Submerged—Fate of Angels who had Left their Heavenly Abode—Time Flood maintained Highest Level—Effect on Vegetation—Soil Regenerated.

CHAPTER VIII. - - - - - p. 193

Condition of Things After Rain and Influx Ceased—Monotony and Weary Waiting—Relieved for Noah's Family by Caring for Animals—At Last Waters Begin to Diminish—How Noah Became Aware of This—Exact Time at which he Noted it—Ten Days Later Ark Grounded—Locality Might be Determined—Table-land on which Ark Rested First Visible—Rate of Decrease of Water—Noah Sends Forth "The Raven"—Why, and with what Results—Then "The Dove"—Why She Returned—Sent Forth Again—Returned with Fresh Olive Leaf—What Noah Could Infer from This—Dove Sent Forth Third Time After Seven Days—Does Not Return—Mention of Seven Days Implies Observance of Sabbath—Noah had the Sacred Records—Drying Up of Waters: Discerned by Removing Covering of Ark—Note of Time When Water had Receded to Permanent

Level—Waited Fifty-Seven Days to Allow Soaked Ground to Dry—Command to Leave Ark—Reason for Enumeration of Persons and Animals—Feelings of All on First Coming Forth—How expressed by Noah—Sacrifice of Every Kind of Clean Animal Shows Account could not have been Fabricated in Later Times—Significance of Noah's Offering—Involved Suffering, Abundantly Recompensed—Delight of the Almighty—Rejoiced in Devotion of His Creatures—Gracious Response—God's Designs Adapted to Decisions of Man's Freewill—Promise not to Renew the Curse—Meaning of This—Reason Given—Further Promise that Natural Course of Things Shall Henceforth be Uninterrupted—Moral Effect of Deluge—Position and First Steps of Survivors—Immediate Need of Running Water and Fruitful Soil—How the Animals Dealt With—Inference as to Mankind Having from first all Useful Animals—Distribution of Work—All Had to be Done by Noah and Family for Themselves—Progenitors of all Human Races had the Fundamental Arts and Crafts—Hence the Truth about Degraded Savages.

CHAPTER IX. - - - - - p. 207

Renewal of Primeval Blessing and Grant—Yet a Difference—Man Permitted to Eat Flesh—Warning Against Cruelty—Reason of Close Connexion in Scripture Between Blood and Soul—Warning Against Bloodshed—Penalty Exacted from Beast as well as Man—Man Commanded to Execute It—Remarkable Reason Given—Inferences from It—No Restriction put upon Increase of Human Race—God's Promise not again to bring a Universal Flood—To Extend to all Future Generations of Men and Beasts—Reason of Solemn Reiteration of Promise—Token Given to Remind God and Man—Enumeration of Sons of Noah and one Grandson—Meaning of Name "Canaan"—Why Mentioned Here—Whole Earth to be Peopled from Noah's Three Sons—Not Yet Fully Accomplished—Noah's Prolonged Life—Why he had no more Sons—His Occupation—His Cultivation of the Vine—What it Led to—Meaning of "Tent"—How Noah Led Into Excess—No Serious Harm if Left Alone—What Occurred—"Ham, the Father of Canaan," Probably a Mistake for "Ham, with Canaan"—Their Conduct Climax of a Course of Irreverence—Tell Shem and Japheth—They Hasten to Remedy the Mischief—Noah Became Partly Aware of what had Happened—Why Ham called "The Small" Son—Noah sent for his Sons, and Elicited Whole Truth—Probably Canaan also Summoned—Then a Startling Utterance—Why Sentence

Pronounced on Canaan—Why not too Severe—Operation of Curse might have been mitigated in its Descent—Here Ended in Extermination—Continuation of Noah's Prophecy—No Direct Blessing Pronounced on Shem—Subjugation of Canaanites by Semites—Blessing on Japheth—How Fulfilled—How he Dwells in Tents of Shem—How Canaan became his Servant—No "Jehovist" Invented this Prophecy—Can come to no other conclusion than that Noah Compiled Document contained in Genesis V.-IX.—Oldest Record in World, except the Adamic—Noah's Prolonged Life—Begot no Children after Flood—Estimate of his Work, Genius and Character—Two concluding Verses added by Shem.

INTRODUCTION.

It is frequently said by those who are regarded as believers in the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, and especially with reference to the Book of Genesis, that the Bible is not intended to teach scientific truth. Too often, what they really mean by this is, that the statements of Holy Scripture are not to be depended upon as actual facts ; in other words, that the Bible is not an authentic record. Now to this it would seem to be a sufficient answer, at any rate in the case of those who profess to believe in the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, to say that if the Bible is not meant to teach scientific truth, it can hardly have been intended to teach unscientific falsehood. But would it not be more becoming on the part of those who profess to believe that the Bible is the Word of God, instead of laying it down beforehand that it was not meant to teach this or that, to examine reverently what it does actually teach, and so discover what were the Divine Purposes in causing it to be written. If we do this, we shall find reason to doubt the maxim that the Bible was not, in any sense, intended to teach scientific truth. In the first place, science is built on facts ; and if facts are revealed in Holy Scripture which science has not yet or had not in former ages discovered, surely the Bible does so far teach scientific truth. For instance, the statement that there was a time when “ the world was without form, and void ; and darkness was on the face of the deep,” *if it be true*, records a state of things in the development of this earth which science might learn something from taking account of. Again, *if it be a fact* that all the earth inhabited by man was once overwhelmed by a flood that rose above the highest mountains to which he had access, it is a fact which, alike in its causes and in its consequences, is one which science can hardly afford to

disregard. Once more, the account given in Genesis of the dispersion of mankind, and of the whence, whither, and cause of that dispersion, *if it be true*, is a fact which gives a foundation to ethnological science, the value of which cannot be overrated. Or to take a more limited range, *if it be true* that the ancestor of the Israelites was brought to Canaan by a migration which started from "Ur of the Chaldees," this is a statement of cardinal importance in the history at least of that particular nation.

Let it be observed that all these are not *in themselves* spiritual facts, or of a religious or moral nature, but are of interest to him who merely regards them as facts of science or history. But it must be remembered that He who perceives beforehand the remotest consequences of everything that He does, and not only so, but wills that each of those consequences should result from it, must, if He be the Author of Holy Scripture, have foreseen that all the statements above referred to might be made to help forward the advancement of science, must have desired that it should be so, and therefore may, in a very real sense, have intended that the Bible should teach scientific truth.

But not only are facts of scientific interest related for us in Holy Scripture, but principles which lie at the foundation of scientific progress are therein asserted. For instance, *if it be true* that One Supreme Being designed and built up all the different entities of which this Universe is composed, we should expect to find a unity of plan and inter-dependence of the various parts upon one another, which will save the mind of the scientific thinker from being crushed by the multitude of phenomena, and bewildered hopelessly by their perplexity.

Again, the record of Creation contained in the Book of Genesis gives us some idea of the method in which the process of development was carried on. For, as we shall see, at certain points this was not

continuous, but proceeded *per saltum* ; new forces being introduced, which were then left for long ages to work out their natural results. Moreover, we have it indicated that when such sudden changes occurred, some of them at any rate, affected the whole universe ; or in other words, were cosmical, not merely terrestrial.

Again, the statement that man was made in the Image of GOD lays down a principle that, *if it be true*, is fundamental, essential, and of far-reaching application, in the science of anthropology, and in all the different sciences into which it branches.

To take another instance, we are distinctly taught that man did not start from utter barbarism, or savagery, or brutal ignorance, but was sent forth on his career with some considerable equipment of knowledge and resource : and this, surely, *if true*, is an essential principle in social development.

Now, although the records of Genesis may not be intended, as their main object, to teach these or other scientific principles, yet, in so far as they do teach them distinctly and unmistakably, such teaching can hardly fail to have been within the scope of the Author of those records, who must therefore have willed that the book should, in some sort, teach scientific truth.

But while we point out how much science has learned, or might learn, from a reverent and careful perusal of Holy Scripture, it is just that we should acknowledge, on the other hand, how greatly the interpretation of the Bible has been, and may be, helped by the progress of science. Not only do historical and archæological discoveries which now crowd upon us so thickly, elucidate passages which have been hitherto obscure, but also the facts of biological and physical science render it possible to explain the records of Creation, which have, till recently, been dark and apparently contradictory, requiring to be accepted by believers as a matter of faith rather than of understanding.

We have then in this work endeavoured to draw out and explain the bearing of what is written in the Book of Genesis, regarded as an authentic statement of facts, on all scientific questions with which the facts come in contact. We have attempted to bring out the interest of the narrative viewed as an historical record, putting aside, for the most part, the moral, religious, and spiritual lessons that may be deduced from it, yet not so as to preclude ourselves from sometimes pointing these out where they are of peculiar interest or importance. In so doing, we have on several occasions adverted to the statements of what is called the "New Criticism"; but we have tried generally to controvert its conclusions rather by the elucidation of facts than by direct arguments: and we think that the reader who peruses this book attentively to the end, will come to the conclusion that as there is no need, so there is little place, for the subversive theories of the "Higher Criticism."

It only remains to say something with regard to the Hebrew text of the Book of Genesis, and its interpretation. It is well known to those who have paid any attention to the subject, that the text of the Old Testament is not in a satisfactory condition: there have been omissions, insertions, transpositions, and alterations of particular words, especially of proper names. It may appear startling at first sight to those who believe the Bible to be the Word of God, to be told that there are these errors in the text as we have it; but no one who has at all studied the subject can be in any doubt that they do really exist. But, in our concern at this discovery, is it not we ourselves who are to blame for assuming too hastily what care the Divine Author ought to have taken of His Work, instead of diligently and reverently studying the facts, in order to ascertain what He in His wisdom has thought fit to do? Neither has the Bible itself anywhere given a definition of Inspiration, nor has the Church ever felt herself called upon to state definitely

all that it implies, or that is consistent with it. As may naturally be supposed, the Book of Genesis, comprehending records of immense antiquity, has not escaped the deteriorating influence of transcription through so many ages ; nor has the Holy Spirit seen fit to prevent this deterioration. The earliest manuscript that now exists containing the Book, is probably not older than the year A.D. 1010 ; but we have evidence with regard to the text which is much more ancient than that. The Greek translation of the Pentateuch, which we now have in the Septuagint, must in all likelihood have been made before the year B.C. 250 ; so that we have in that version the readings of manuscripts probably thirteen hundred years older than any that now exist. Of course the Septuagint has been transcribed over and over again, and has suffered deterioration of its own ; but we have one manuscript written certainly not later than the middle of the fifth century after Christ ; so that in that case we get considerably nearer to the fountain-head. Again, the Samaritans finally broke off all intercourse with the Jews certainly four hundred years before Christ ; and they had manuscripts of the Pentateuch, the transcription of which from that time was independent of Jewish copyists. The Samaritan manuscripts have no doubt suffered deterioration of their own, and the date of the earliest which we now have is only of the eleventh century, A.D. ; yet the errors which have been introduced into the Samaritan manuscripts are not likely to be exactly the same as those made by the Jewish scribes ; so that we can in some degree correct the mistakes of the latter by means of the former. Besides this we have S. Jerome's Latin Version, called the Vulgate, made by him about the year 400, A.D., from Hebrew manuscripts which were in his possession, and which, therefore, represents more or less perfectly the state of the Hebrew text at that time, and helps to show us what was the earlier reading, where the present Massoretic text of

the Hebrew Bible has gone wrong. All this evidence we have endeavoured to make use of, finding the readings of the Septuagint in particular, as it seems to us, especially valuable; and have thus in effect reconstructed a text which in some passages will be new to most of our readers.

As for the translation, we have followed, for the most part, the English Revised Version: but we have not scrupled to change words which seem to us not to convey a true impression to the ordinary reader, and passages in which our emendation of the text renders it necessary to adopt a different version.

We have tried to make the work consecutive, and intelligible to the ordinary English reader, and therefore we have relegated all points which required a longer and more minute discussion to the Appendix. Yet even with regard to these, we have wished to make what we have said perfectly intelligible to the educated.

THE
BOOK OF GENESIS
TREATED AS
AN AUTHENTIC RECORD.


PART I.—THE ADAMIC NARRATIVE.

CHAPTER I.

THE RECORD OF CREATION.

V. 1. *Originally God created the heaven and the earth.*

Thus suddenly, without preparation, explanation, or description, is presented to us that august Being Whom thenceforth it is the main object of the Bible to reveal, in order that men may apprehend Him. That Revelation begins at once, for we learn something from the word itself by which He is designated. The word “Elohim” * being underived, plural in form, yet taking a verb singular, seems well adapted to be the symbol of a mysterious existence, unique in nature, and unapproachable in majesty. Of this Being, then, it is declared that He originally *created the heaven and the earth*, and the question at once arises, What are we to understand by creation? Viewed in the light of modern research, creation can only mean an energy which may be described by something like the following definition :—“ When God is spoken of as creating anything, He is to be understood as forming those materials, making those capacities, establishing those forces, and instituting



* The English reader must remember that almost all Hebrew words have the accent on the last syllable; so that the above word is pronounced “Elohi’m.”

those laws, which, being called into play by circumstances favourable to their action, will, in due time, lead to its production.' '*

The next question which arises is, whether the creation here spoken of is that of which the state of things described in verse 2 is the beginning, or some previous action of the Almighty of which it was the result. We think that there can be no hesitation in accepting the former of these two alternatives. We read in the first verse, *God created the heaven and the earth* ; and in the first verse of the second chapter,—at the conclusion of the work done on the earth as it existed in the condition described in the second verse of the first chapter,—*And the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the host of them ; and by the seventh day God finished His work which He had made.* (Genesis ii, 1 and 2.) Comparing these two statements, we seem naturally led to the conclusion that the former is the introduction to the work of which the latter declares the termination, and therefore, that the creation spoken of in verse 1 means that which is described in the remainder of the first chapter.† It is not of course denied that the state of things set forth in verse 2 was brought about by previous creative action on the part of God ; probably it was the result of several such actions, beginning with the first calling into existence out of nothing of the rudimentary material of which all things were made. All that we mean is that those previous creations are not referred to in the words of the first verse, though they are implied by the statement contained in the second.

This then was the condition of things from which the creation here described started ;

* We must not assume that some of the results of creation may not have been previously in existence somewhere in the Universe of God. What we are justified in saying is, that they did not exist in the world with which we are conversant, till the Creative Word was spoken.

† See Appendix A, p. 135.

V. 2. *And the earth was in a state of waste and emptiness, and darkness upon the face of surging waters :*

The word “deep” used in the English versions conveys a false impression in two ways. First of all the Hebrew word “*thedom*”^{*} does not necessarily imply depth. For instance, in Exodus xv. 5 and 8, it is used of the surging waters of the Red Sea, which are of no great depth. Again, “deep water” in English, generally suggests the idea of stillness, whereas the Hebrew word implies commotion. Thus the true interpretation is that which we have given, “surging waters,” or “waters in commotion.”

Let us try to picture to ourselves the scene as it then presented itself to angelic eyes, for there were none other to behold it. On all sides a dreary waste of tossing waters ; no appearance or reality of life anywhere, either above or below ; not a piece of weed, nor a fish darting through the surface, or hiding itself beneath ; not even an animalcule or a zoophyte, or any more lowly organism ; and over all this, an impenetrable darkness covering it as with a close veil. And now let us see what such a condition of things as this implies. The earth, once a revolving mass of molten material, has cooled down sufficiently to allow of a crust being formed on the surface, and that crust has become strong enough to sustain vast masses of water. Probably this crust, being formed from molten material by the gradual withdrawal of the heat, would at first have a smooth surface ; with moderate elevations and depressions,—like huge bubbles, perhaps,—at different points, arising from the cooling mass not being altogether homogeneous, but not implying any great irregularities, such as mountains and valleys ; so that the ocean above it would be pretty nearly of the same depth throughout. Yet the temperature of that ocean is still so great as to keep the water in perpetual commotion, to which commotion the tides caused by

* The “th” in Hebrew is always pronounced like the “th” in thistle.

the moon, which must have been already formed, would contribute. For the surging of the water is not produced by any blast of wind; there is as yet no atmosphere which could raise a tempest. But the unlooked for phenomenon, not as yet revealed, as far as we are aware, by any discovery of science, is the profound darkness hanging over the whole universe. How are we to explain this? At first sight we might imagine that the ether by which light is transmitted had not yet been created, but a little reflection will show that such an idea is unlikely. For the ether not merely transmits light, but is also the means by which heat radiates away, and without such a medium the earth could hardly have cooled down from its original state of intensely heated vaporous material. We must therefore conceive that the ether existed, but was as yet imperfectly constituted, so as to be incapable of transmitting the undulations which convey light. With what did the transition from this condition of the earth originate?

And the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters.

Another mysterious existence is here brought to our view,—*The Spirit of God*, Who is represented to us under the similitude of a sea-bird floating calmly upon the surface of tossing billows. This existence is closely connected with God, but so far the nature of that connection is not revealed. Yet the Hebrew word employed to designate the Spirit tells us something.

“Ruach”* means originally breath or air in motion; and the idea which it conveys when employed to denote “Spirit” is that of an unseen influence making itself known, like the wind, only by its effects. Of this Spirit too, much more is revealed to us in Holy Scripture, but with that revelation we have

* The letters “ch,” when used to denote a Hebrew character, are always pronounced like the “ch” in “chemist.”

only to do here, in so far as the presence of God's Spirit implies that some new energy is about to be put forth.

V. 3. *And God said, Let there be Light :*

To whom was this mandate spoken, or for what purpose was it uttered? We cannot suppose that it was addressed as a command to any of the angelic host, for creation is nowhere ascribed in Holy Scripture to any created being: it is a power which belongs to God alone. S. Athanasius considers that by God, throughout this chapter, God the Father is intended, and that the words in question, with the similar words uttered before each creative act, are spoken by the Father to the Son, as the agent of the creative power.* But it seems more natural to think that they are the fiat of the Deity spoken forth to the universe. Why then, it may be still asked, was there this utterance when a silent action of the Divine Will would have sufficed? The answer is, that though it was not addressed to the angels, it was made for their sake. The Sons of God, gathered round in eager expectation, were informed by these words what was going to be done, and then witnessed their immediate fulfilment.

And there was light.

Up to this time, only outside of this external universe there had existed the eternal radiance of Him Who dwelleth *in the light which no man can approach unto*. But now this universe itself is suddenly flooded with light, such as caused, we may suppose, the angelic spectators to burst forth into an exultant hymn of praise. The illumination, we have already suggested, was probably occasioned by a change in the constitution of the ethereal medium, by which the sun and the fixed stars were now enabled to radiate light as well as heat.

* Four Discourses against the Arians. Disc. II., Ch. 18, Sect. 31. Also Disc. III., Ch. 26, Sect. 29. "Anyone . . . will perceive how in the beginning the Father said to Him (the Son), 'Let there be light, and let there be a firmament.'"

V. 4. *And God saw the light, that it was good.*

—Beautiful in itself, fit for the purposes for which it was intended. This is no utterance of the Deity, and therefore, no word of commendation for work well done, as though He had entrusted the making of the light to some inferior being, but it expresses God's own satisfaction in that which He had made. If we may venture on such a comparison, it resembles an artist of the highest order delighting in the excellence of his work, which none can appreciate so well as he himself.* Yet something further was required. Any observant person may have noticed a difference which there is between light and sound, both of which are caused by the undulations of a medium. From whatever point a sound has already reached, it spreads in all directions. Now there is nothing like this in the case of light; when a ray is admitted into a dark room it proceeds in a straight line across the room, and if, on reaching the opposite wall, it can go out by an exactly similar hole to that by which it has entered, it will give no illumination at all, except in the direction of its course, beyond what is reflected from the particles of dust floating in the beam itself. In other words, there is no lateral diffusion of the light. On the other hand, if a musical sound enters by a similar hole, it will immediately be heard in every part of the room, showing that the undulations causing sound spread all around. To originate this difference required a separate action of the Divine creative power.

God divided the light from the darkness.

The luminiferous ether was modified in such a way that the light could only be transmitted from any point which it had reached, forward and not laterally. If this had not been done, the distinction between day

* Cf. Ps. civ. 31. "Let the Lord rejoice in His works," and Our Lord's admiration of the flowers of the field. Matt. vi. 29.

and night would have been very imperfect. The radiation of the sun, though cut off from one part of the earth by the intervention of the other part, would have flowed round so as to afford a daylight, lessened indeed, but not obscure. But now the light was properly separated from the darkness.

V. 5. *And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night.*

The new designations imply that the alternation of light and darkness was an hitherto unknown occurrence in the universe, and the words by which they are distinguished were probably unheard before. They are uttered by the Almighty apparently for the sake of the angels, in order that they might know how to describe the periods of light and darkness.

The creation of light in response to the Divine command must have been instantaneous, because it constituted the first day's work, and that day could not begin till the light appeared. Later perhaps, when the evening was coming on, the further change in the ether which we have noted took place. In due time the daylight passed away, and the night came, and then the darkness passed away, and the morning arose, and thus :

There was evening and there was morning, one day.

There is no reason for supposing that a day was any different from what we call a day now, namely : one entire revolution of the earth upon its axis. Clearly the work done on the first day would not require any longer time, nor needed even so much as this. So far, there is no reason for supposing that a day meant, as some have suggested, a long period of time.

V. 6. *And God said, Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.*

V. 7. *And God made the expanse, and divided the waters which were under the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse :*

The Hebrew word *rāqia'* * †, which the English versions render “firmament,” and we have translated by “expanse,” means something spread out or extended. What it was that was thus spread out depends upon the meaning which we assign to the division of the waters. If that division means that a portion of the ocean was carried right away from its connection with this earth, and established in some distant region of space, we can, of course, form no idea of what that was which kept these separated waters in their place. In that case we can only receive the statement as it stands, and acknowledge that it is a matter entirely beyond our cognizance or thought; but a supposition of this kind seems extremely improbable. When we read, as partly occasioning the deluge, that *the windows of heaven were opened, and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights*, (Genesis vii. 11-12), surely *rain* must mean what it always does, namely, water poured down upon the earth from the clouds above. Yet the expression, *windows of heaven*, shows that it was the same water which, in the passage of the text, is represented as being separated from the waters below. So, in the 148th Psalm, verse 4, when the writer mentions *the waters that be above the heavens*, he can hardly have been praising God for an ocean somewhere in space, having no connection with this earth, and of which he knew nothing. He must have meant the waters of which he says in the 147th Psalm, verse 8, *Who covereth the heaven with clouds, Who prepareth rain for the earth*. We must then conclude that the separated waters were the vast body of water contained in the atmosphere. That being so, we can see what was the extended medium which at this time was created. It could only have been the atmosphere,—supporting immense quantities of water in the form of clouds and

* The ‘ represents the Hebrew Letter “ayin,” which is a strong guttural, unpronounceable by English throats.

† See Appendix B. p. 136.

invisible vapour,—which is spread out as a vast envelope encompassing the earth. We are thus led to the inference that up to this time the earth had not been surrounded by a medium capable of supporting the vapour of water ; which, as we know, is the case with the moon at the present time.

But now let us ask in what way this atmosphere was created. Of the two gases of which it is principally composed, nitrogen and oxygen, the latter apparently must have existed long before, for it is a constituent of various substances which are found in the crust of the earth. But nitrogen, which constitutes nearly four-fifths of the atmosphere, is not met with anywhere else on our globe, except as derived from the air. We would suggest, therefore, that it was the creation of nitrogen that was the work of the second day.

And it was so.

We need not think that the atmosphere was immediately constituted as we have it now, in fact, we have good reason to suppose that it was very different in remote bygone ages, for it must at one time have contained an amount of carbonic acid very much greater than at present. The materials and forces were then brought into existence which would produce in due time the atmosphere which we now have, but all that may have taken place at once was such an initiation of the process of its construction that it was possible for the watery vapour to begin to ascend in vast quantities from the ocean, and spread itself in the space above. Hitherto that vapour, as soon as it began to ascend, was met by the intense cold of the inter-stellar spaces, from which there was nothing to protect it, and so was condensed and fell back at once into the waters ; but now there was a medium which would enable it to retain its heat. That the separation of the water took place to a considerable extent before the next revolution of the earth was accomplished, is all that the Record requires.

V. 8. *And God called the expanse Heaven.*

Which fact, as we saw in a former instance, shows that what the word designated was a new thing ; so that we must suppose that not only this earth, but all the heavenly bodies were devoid of an atmosphere till this time. But the word used to denote this atmosphere could hardly have been itself new. The angels must have had occasion to speak of the higher " heavens " long before this time, so that it was only a new application of the word when it was applied to the atmosphere surrounding this earth. We must remember, then, that the Hebrew word " shamayim " * has two meanings closely connected together. It signifies first of all that portion of space, and the air or atmosphere contained in it, which immediately surrounds this earth † ; and then that extension of this space to the regions in which the heavenly bodies are situated and perform their courses. The same twofold meaning must be assigned to the word " rāqia' " of which " shamayim " is the counterpart. And if it be objected that " rāqia' " always denotes extended *material*, and not merely expanse of empty space, the answer is that the atmosphere of this earth thins away gradually till it is lost in that ethereal medium which pervades all space.

And there was evening and there was morning, a second day.

V. 9. *And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear : and it was so.*

* See Appendix B, p. 136.

† For instance, we have in this chapter, verses 26, 28 and 30, the expression, " the fowl of the heaven," which our English versions translate rightly " the fowl of the air," ; in Lev. xxvi. 19, " I will make your heaven as iron," where the meaning evidently is that all genial influences from the atmosphere should be stopped ; and again " drinketh water of the rain of heaven." Deut. xi. 11. Thus it was used as a suitable name for the outspread atmosphere.

Although an immense quantity of water was separated from the ocean by the work of the second day, what was left still covered the whole surface of the earth. The depth may not have been anywhere very great, but still it was sufficient not to lay bare any portion of the surface even through the ebbing of the tide. At the present time the sea occupies nearly three-fourths of the earth's surface, and the average depth is greater than the average height of the land, so that if all the land which is above the sea-level were spread over the bottom of the sea it is obvious that the ocean would cover the whole surface. But now there came a creative act which produced an immediate change. We know that the crust of the earth, as we have it now, oscillates in longer or shorter periods of time, so that probably much of what is dry land has been under water, and has emerged again, several times. This process is always going on,—in some places the land is gradually sinking, in others the bed of the ocean is slowly rising. What, therefore, was effected on the third day must have been the creation and setting at work of some force which produces these results, and which had not previously existed. The gradual cooling of the earth would not be sufficient to account for this process: it could only occasion a shrinking of the earth's surface,—with perhaps sometimes a disturbance and breaking up of the crust, owing to the cooling differently affecting different materials,—but apparently it could not produce that slow elevation or depression which we know to have gone on, and to be going on, in many parts. There must then be some other force which was introduced at the time when this slow oscillation was set up. What that force was we do not at present know, but we suggest, merely as a surmise, which may some day be either verified or proved to be incorrect, that the movements in question may be connected with that mysterious force of magnetism which points the needle to the north. Of course, we must not suppose

that the conformation of the sea and land which we have now was established at once. It is sufficient that some dry land very soon appeared ; it may have been a very small area, partly covered when the tide rose, but large enough to admit of the introduction, as we shall find immediately, of the first germs of vegetable life.

V. 10. *And God called the dry land Earth, and the gathering together of the waters called He Seas :*

Neither of these words, perhaps, was then used for the first time, but a new sense was given to them by which they might express a new arrangement. Hitherto the word “ éretz ” had been used to express this earth as opposed to the heavens : now the meaning was given to it also of “ land ” as opposed to “ sea.” Again, up to this time the word “ yamim,” if it were used at all, could only have denoted the ocean covering the whole surface of the earth ; but now it would denote that ocean broken up into portions more or less separated by intervening tracts of land. We may conclude, from this new use of the words, that hitherto such an arrangement of land and water had been unknown in the universe of God.

And God saw that it was good.

Knowing how this arrangement has influenced the destinies of man, and has called forth energies and acts of fortitude which could hardly have been exerted without it ; observing also the extreme beauty which results from the interspersion and interaction of sea and land ; we can in some degree understand how He Who could foresee all this may have exulted in that which He had wrought.

V. 11. *And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herb yielding seed, and fruit-tree bearing fruit after its kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth :*

This enumeration is not an exhaustive or scientific description of the vegetable kingdom. It clearly only mentions such products as would be of use to man ; *grass* for the food of cattle, with the flowers of the

field which grow amongst it, *herb yielding seed*—which included the cereals—denoting the edible vegetables, and *fruit-trees bearing fruit* suitable for man's food. What was it that was then made ? We can only think of the lowliest possible germ of vegetable life ; yet that germ contained in it the potency of the whole wonderful vegetable kingdom. From the vital powers and capacities shut up in it were evolved alike the mighty shadowing tree, and the insignificant moss or fungus. From it arose the grass spread over the earth's surface, and the corn for *bread that strengtheneth the heart of man*. From it sprang the beauty of the flowers and the sweetness of the fruits. From it came the marine plants as well as the terrestrial ; and all those wondrous orders of plant life which have perished, as well as the variety which remains. What a conception does it give us of the marvellous power and wisdom of the Creator that all this should have been contained in a little germ of protoplasm which may have been too small even for our most powerful microscope to discover. Yet we must remember that force of all kinds, though it may be attached to matter, and move it in space, does not itself occupy space, and therefore the most varied and most wondrous powers can be stored in a molecule of matter : and a storage which could produce such effects seems more admirable than the production of each effect suddenly by a Creative Word.

Like all the lowliest organisms, the first germ of life would begin to propagate itself with a marvellous rapidity ; and when the tide arose, and swept over a portion of the uncovered area, some of its products would be carried into the sea, and commence a marine existence, while some would cling to the land, and become the progenitors of all the terrestrial plants.

Hitherto each Creative Word has affected the whole universe ; light pervades all space ; the nitrogen which we have supposed was created on the second day is found in some of the nebulæ ; and, lastly the

magnetic energy, to which we have surmised that the telluric movements may be attributed, appears to exert itself in connection with the sun, and therefore presumably with the other heavenly bodies. But we have no reason to suppose that any form of life similar to that with which we are acquainted exists anywhere but on this earth. The Record represents that the results of this Creative Word showed themselves at once.

And it was so.

V. 12. *And the earth brought forth grass, herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, after its kind : and God saw that it was good.*

Not a blade of grass, or corn, not a cluster of grapes, not a bunch of dates, not a single bloom of cherry, plum, or apple, came forth into material existence, probably for millions of years ; yet the forces and capacities which would produce them were so infallible in their action, so certain in their result, that to the Vision of the All-seeing Designer, all these things stood forth as clearly discernible as if they were already in material existence ; and delighting in what He foreknew and foresaw, He felt *that it was good.*

V. 13. *And there was evening and there was morning, a third day.*

V. 14. *And God said, let there be sources of light in the expanse of the heaven, to divide the day from the night.*

From the marvels of God's work in the infinitely small, we are carried to the enormous dimensions of the celestial bodies, and the infinite depths of space of the higher heaven in which their courses are run. We are told that the first purpose of the sources of light which God willed to create in this expanse was to divide the day from the night. Already in the fourth and fifth verses of this chapter we are informed that *God divided the light from the darkness, and called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night.* It appears then, that even after that first

division, day and night were not so completely separated as God intended them finally to be ; and to see how this was, and what further was required to be done, we must go a little into the history of the development of what we now call the sun and moon, and endeavour to learn what condition they were in at this time. Originally, we know not how many millions of years ago, the matter of which the sun is composed was spread out, in the form of intensely heated vapour, to beyond the orbit of Neptune,—a distance of 2,746,000,000 miles from the place now occupied by the sun ; the depth of this expanded vapour being very small in comparison with its extent. Gradually this nebula shrunk through the radiation of its heat, and throwing off or leaving behind successive portions of its material, it initiated the planets of our system, one after another. At the time of the creation with which we are concerned, this process had gone on till Neptune, Uranus, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, and this earth, had been started on the course of their evolution : indeed the earth, as we have seen, had already progressed a long way in that course. Probably, in the time during which it was doing so, Venus also, and Mercury, had been detached from the fiery mass. From the time when the latter was separated, the sun, as we know, had become too compact to throw off any further considerable portion of its matter. The shrinking process continued, but proceeded, we may suppose, more slowly, as the enormous body attained greater consistency. Now let us consider what appearance that body had as seen from the earth at the time with which we are engaged. It must then have formed an immense disc somewhat bulging at the centre, lying pretty nearly in the present plane of the ecliptic. Now such a disc, viewed edgeways, as it would be from the earth, would present the appearance of a bar, of a luminosity feeble as compared with the present brilliancy of the sun, slightly rounded at the extremities, and rather thicker in the middle, where

also the luminosity would be somewhat greater. For the sake of making the matter perfectly clear and definite let us suppose that the circuit of this disc was 10,000,000 miles within the orbit of Mercury. Then, as that orbit has a diameter of about 70,000,000 miles, the diameter of the disc would be about 50,000,000 miles. The bar then which represented it would be 50,000,000 miles long. Taking the present diameter of the sun roughly at 850,000 miles, the bar would appear about sixty times longer than the width of the sun as we now see it. The consequence of this would be that the period of partial light, while the bar was setting, would be sixty times as long as the apparent time which the disc of the sun now takes in sinking beneath the horizon. Putting the latter roughly at three minutes, the former would be three hours ; and the period of daylight would be increased, and the period of night would be diminished, to that extent. Similarly when it rose, the light would be only partial for the first three hours. If the day were of the same length as at the present time, namely twenty-four hours, there would be, roughly speaking, fifteen hours of daylight, and only nine of night. These two things, the comparatively feeble luminosity of the sun, and prolonged daylight are sufficient to account for the division of day and night being at the time in question still imperfect.*

We have already spoken of tides in the earthly ocean, implying the existence at that time of the moon, which is the principal cause of those tides. That

* We have adopted the theory of the development of the solar system which has been most in vogue. But it must be observed that any other theory will serve equally well, provided that two points be allowed. First, that the sun had not assumed its present form and illuminating power at the time when the earth was already constituted much as it is at present ; and secondly, that the theory is compatible with the idea of the introduction at that time of a fresh force or energy, needed to complete the final development of the sun.

existence could only have begun when the earth was in a much earlier state of development than at the time of the creation of which we are speaking. It must have been when the earth was still in the condition of highly-heated vapour, or viscous matter, that it threw off from itself the material of the moon. But as that material was far less in bulk, say, approximately one-fiftieth part of the material still remaining to constitute the earth, it would cool far more rapidly than the latter ; in other words, its development would be far quicker. So much has this been the case that at the present time the moon appears to have parted with all its heat, and to be little more than a burnt-out cinder. But at the time we are speaking of, it may have been in its prime ; and there is some reason for supposing that the moon, which is now sea-less, may have been covered with an ocean. The moon then, as at present, must have caused tides in the terrestrial ocean, and as it is known that those tides produce a minute retarding effect on the rotation of the earth, it has been supposed that that rotation, at the immensely distant time to which we are referring, was more rapid than it is now, and that the day and night were proportionately shorter. But, on the other hand, the gradual shrinking of the mass of the earth, as it parted with its heat, would have a counteracting effect, tending to increase the velocity of rotation, so that on the whole we are inclined to think that the length of the day at the time we are speaking of was pretty much what it is now. The same cause which prevented the sun, as it then existed, from being an effectual source of light to the earth, would probably render the light of the moon, which we know is only a reflection of that of the sun, either invisible, or so slight that it too would fail as a light-bearer. Therefore God said :

V. 14. *Let there be sources of light in the expanse of the heaven, to divide the day from the night ; and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years :*

V. 15. *and let them be for sources of light in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth ; and it was so.*

Probably the sources of light did not assume their present aspect for millions of years after this was spoken ; but the forces which would produce that result were then started, and were so inevitable in their effect that the issue might be already declared, *it was so.*

V. 16. *So God made the two great sources of light.*

In what way did He make them ? Simply by taking measures that the sun should be brought into its present state, and thus the moon also be enabled to fulfil its office. And what was the new power that effected this change ? We know so little of the forces which are at work in the sun that we cannot even offer a guess as to what was the new energy or element then created. But we may be sure that from the moment of the utterance of the Creative Word, a mode of action was set up which gradually, after we know not how many ages, reduced the circumference and lengthened the axis of the luminary, till it assumed its present form and brilliancy. We may conclude that without the introduction of this new force the sun would never have attained its present shape, heat and radiancy. As soon as it did so, the moon also would give its full light.

The inferior radiation of light, and, we may add, of heat also, which had previously existed, would be sufficient to render possible the development of the germs of life on this earth, in its earlier stages. But the evolution of the higher organisms would necessitate a continually increasing amount of light and heat for their vigorous existence, till at last the sun's potency was such as, or probably considerably greater than, that which we now experience.

So God made the two great sources of light, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night ;

The splendour of the sun has been felt to be so dominant in the day, and the milder radiance of the moon so queenly in the night, that men have in all ages felt the temptation, not merely to acknowledge their regal majesty, but to fall down and worship them as gods.

Besides the object of dividing more satisfactorily the day from the night, the two luminaries were to *be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years.* (Genesis i. 14.) A *sign* is that which signifies something to the observer, beyond its own presence. Thus when the sun is at its highest elevation, men know that half the time of daylight is gone ; in fact, to those who have no other means of telling the time, the position of the sun in the heavens in some degree answers the purpose of a clock. In like manner, the rising, culmination, and setting, both of the sun and of the moon, indicate roughly the cardinal points of the compass, and enable men, to some extent, when they are travelling, to discern in what direction they are moving, and at what point they have arrived. Their efficacy in this respect has increased with the progress of astronomical science, and its application especially to the art of navigation, till men are able to discover, by observation of the heavenly bodies, the precise spot of this globe over which they are sailing. Thus, the sun and moon are signs to men of their position, alike in time and space. So again, the moon, by its change of phase from full moon to the succeeding full moon, marks out an interval of time by which, from the first, men found it convenient to reckon ; and the shifting of the point at which the sun rises, indicates even to uninstructed men a difference of *season*. And lastly, the sun, by the interval from one rising to the next, marks out the space of day ; and by its return to the point of its rising, when it is most to the south or most to the north of east, tells of a revolution of a *year*.

But there was something further ;

God made the two great sources of light, . . . and the stars.

Sometimes these latter words have been taken as if they were parenthetical, introduced merely by the way to show that the stars also were created by God at some time or other, but not necessarily implying that they were created at the same time as the sun and moon.* But we think that the Hebrew will scarcely admit of this supposition. The one verb *made* applies to *the stars* as well as to *the two great sources of light*; and it seems hardly possible to separate the latter from the former. Nor is there any need to do so: the same force which was set to work in the material of the sun was needed also to bring the fixed stars to that concentration and brilliancy which now belongs to them. They might be at various stages of their development,—looking perhaps, as seen from the earth, like little splashes of faint light; but, however that may be, a new energy was now set up within them, to produce a condensation and radiance which they would not have attained without it.

V. 17. *And God gave them in the expanse of the heaven to give light upon the earth,*

V. 18. *And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good.*

Although, at the moment, the sun was little more than an immense disc of fiery matter, and the moon barely discernible from its feeble luminosity, and the stars not

* Thus, for instance, in the Preface to Dr. Pusey's Lectures on Daniel, p. xviii. of the Third Edition, he speaks of "the remarkable parenthetic mention of the stars in Genesis, when in the detailed account of the creation of the sun and moon, and of their offices for our earth, there are appended the simple words *and the stars*, as though it were intended only to guard against the error that they might otherwise be thought to be uncreated." Even the authors of the English Revised Version seem to have dealt rather unfairly with the passage, by inserting the words *he made*, and rendering it, *he made the stars also*.

yet formed as we know them, yet the Divine Eye could already see them all in their glorious splendour, in their beneficent influences, and in their manifold services to man ; and seeing all this God could exult in that which He had made, and feel *that it was good*.

V. 19. *And there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day.*

V. 20. *And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly moving things, living soul,* and let fowl fly above the earth on the face of the expanse of heaven.*

The question arises at once whether we have here the record of two creative acts, one originating the marine animals, the other the birds, or whether both were created by a single Divine energy. The Authorised Version, by rendering the passage *Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life and fowl that may fly, above the earth*, has rather suggested the idea that a single creative act gave rise to the birds as well as the marine creatures. But the Revised Version gives the words more accurately *and let fowl fly*, and the repetition of the word *let* seems to involve two distinct acts of creation. Supposing this to be so, the further question suggests itself, whether marine existence was initiated by the creation of an entirely new germ, or whether one of the germs of vegetable life which had already been generated was taken as a basis, and a fresh energy was infused into it, in order to produce the marine animals. We have the following considerations to guide us in answering that question. In the first place, the protoplasm, which forms the material foundation of life, is the same for vegetable and for animal ; ultimately they are alike constituted of molecules which consist of carbonic acid, water, and ammonia. Secondly, the distinction in sex begins to show itself at a pretty early point in the development of plant life no less

* *Soul* is here used collectively, just as we use *fowl* to denote a collection of birds.

than of animal. Thirdly, in their early stages animals and plants are so exactly alike, that they cannot be distinguished by outward form. Indeed, there are some existences which seem to be animal in one stage of their development, and vegetable in another.

Considering all this, it seems to be more probable that the germ from which the marine animals sprang was constituted by the infusion of a new energy into one of the vegetable germs already existing. Can we say what this new energy was? We think we can. Observe that the waters are commanded to bring forth *moving things with a living soul*, or, as the Hebrew runs, *the moving thing (with) the soul of life*. What then is the soul? The answer is that in the Hebrew language it seems always to denote the seat of, or capacity for, sensation.* The possession of this, then, is that which constitutes the difference between animal and vegetable being, even when there appears to be no difference in their anatomy.

Again, the question arises, whether the germ which originated the bird life was a new creation, or whether one of the germs, which after a short interval would be produced abundantly from the original germ initiating marine life, was taken, and a fresh energy introduced into it to constitute the starting-point of the fowl. The resemblances between all kinds of animal life are so numerous that we can hardly avoid adopting the latter alternative. Can we then say how far the original marine germs would go in their development, and at what point the new energy, infused into one of those germs, and latent in all the developed forms produced from it, would begin to work, in order

* We must be careful here not to confuse "sensation" with "sensitiveness," which belongs to plants as well as animals. The difference is, that that which is affected by sensitiveness is unconscious of the movements by which we are aware that sensitiveness exists, while that which experiences sensation is conscious of the sensation.

that there might be further progress? We may suggest tentatively that the original marine germ might go so far as to produce all the cold-blooded animals; but that as soon as the blood began gradually to become warm, the new energy showed itself. In this way, from very small beginnings—

V. 21. *God created the great sea-monsters, and every soul of life that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kinds, and every winged fowl after its kind : And God saw that it was good.*

V. 22. *And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.*

Now that there were sentient beings, they could feel the Divine blessing, though they could not understand the Divine word. Are we to suppose that some fresh creative act here came in, causing their fruitfulness? We think not; because it had already been said *Let the waters bring forth abundantly*. What we have here is the Divine approval and blessing of that instinct which inspires every animal to propagate itself.

V. 23. *And there was evening and there was morning, a fifth day.*

Before we go any further, we think it well at once to face the momentous question, whether some malign power has intervened,—not to create anything new, that it could not do,—but to pervert in some degree the course of the development of life? The question is indeed suggested, even at an earlier point. It is not only that some plants produce poisons; for it may be said that a poison is a thing that is good in itself, and only becomes evil by being misapplied. Nor is it merely that vegetation, under certain circumstances, produces miasmata, hurtful to man and beast; for it may be argued that man and beast to whom those miasmata would be injurious were never intended to go to the spots where they were engendered. But there remains the great fact that plant life is, under

its present conditions, a tremendous struggle for existence ; that though unconsciously, yet very really, the stronger everywhere tramples upon the weaker, and as far as it can gain anything, crushes it ruthlessly. In this way it foreshadows what takes place with a greater intensity when we come to animal life. There the struggle is so fearful, that one animal will pitilessly rob another of any store which it has collected with great labour and industry. It will slay without scruple any fellow-creature that stands in its way. It will kill and devour whatever living thing it needs for the satisfaction of its appetite, and often it will do this with added circumstances of cruelty ; as when, for instance, a cat amuses itself with a maimed mouse before devouring it. And the vast fossil remains of the geological periods, with their terrible weapons of offence, prove that this struggle for existence was going on long before man appeared upon this earth. Can we believe that this was the state of things which God originally pronounced to be *good* ? Does it not seem evident that some malignant power has intervened, and, as far as it could do so, marred the development of living things, and perverted it from what it was originally intended to be ? And when we are told that not even a sparrow falleth to the ground without our Heavenly Father, is it not clear that all this goes on as it were in His immediate presence ; and if our hearts are wrung by the contemplation of such misery, can we believe that He is not moved by it with infinitely deeper feeling ? Surely we must exclaim that *an enemy hath done this* ; an enemy of God bent on vexing Him to the utmost, by perverting, as far as he was allowed to do so, God's good into terrible evil. No doubt all this has been permitted and over-ruled ; the struggle for life has been made to evolve the highest and most beautiful forms of life, and to maintain them in their highest efficiency. But we can hardly suppose that the Almighty would have used such means even for such

ends, had there not been something far more momentous which necessitated this; and that something could have been hardly anything else than the moral and spiritual perfection of His rational creatures. It is commonly assumed that Satan and the Angels who fell with him had no place given them of repentance and recovery. Yet all God's dealings with the Spirit of Evil, so far as we are permitted to contemplate them, seem to teach us a different lesson. There is a forbearance with the fallen archangel, an unwillingness to put forth power against him, and a disposition even to argue and remonstrate with him, which seems to intimate to us how God loved him, and how He was cut to the heart by his defection. And so the sufferings of all lower life, deeply felt as they were, could not weigh in the balance against the longing and effort for recovery of the magnificent spiritual beings who had gone astray. They were allowed to work their evil will in order that the Almighty, patiently remedying their mischief, and turning every fresh outrage into a means of higher good, might, if possible, convince them how fruitless was their struggle against Him, and win them, if it might be, by every fresh exhibition of His power and His goodness, to a better mind. On the other hand, what a lesson to the unfallen angels must the spectacle of all this have been! No doubt, even if things had gone on in their appointed course, the orderly development of life would have necessitated their wise superintendence and careful guidance, but now how gladly must they have co-operated with God in counterworking the evil, and doing their part in watching over the line of development so as to repair mischief, and bring it about that God's great purposes should not be defeated in the end.

V. 24. *And God said, Let the earth bring forth living soul after its kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after its kind :*

We have here to consider whether the germ of

marine life, or that of what we may call the bird life, was taken as the basis for this further development. Supposing, as it seems we must do, that the latter was an advance upon the former, we can hardly doubt that it was from it that further progress started. What then was the new energy which was infused into the germ which already, as we have supposed, could produce the life of warm-blooded animals, in order to bring about a yet higher stage of existence? Here again, we can only suggest an answer tentatively. We may imagine that the new energy was that which rendered possible the progress from oviparous animals to the mammalia ;

and it was so.

V. 25. *And God made the beast of the earth after its kind, and the cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the ground after its kind.*

It would be ages before all these animals stood forth in visible material existence, but all the forces, energies, and capacities were now set at work which, in due time, and in due order, would produce them.

And God saw that it was good.

With ever-increasing delight and satisfaction in each step taken to a higher level, the Omniscient, to Whose gaze the wonderful and beautiful result was already clearly present, contemplated His marvellous work, and saw that it was *good*.

V. 26. *And God said, Let us make man.*

Already the mystery implied in the plurality of the Divine name begins to unfold itself. To whom was this word *Let Us make* addressed? We have said that Creation is a prerogative which God does not impart to any of His creatures: probably it is in its nature incommunicable. Therefore, these words cannot have been addressed to angels, though it is likely that they may have been uttered in their presence. We must suppose then that there is some distinction in the Divine nature which renders it possible for it to be said, *Let Us*. What that distinction is, we

could not tell from anything that is contained in the present narrative, though it is abundantly set forth elsewhere in Holy Scripture. But even so far as we have gone, we might judge from the mention of the Spirit of God in the second verse, evidently as connected with the work of creation, that that Spirit took part in the Divine colloquy. The Catholic Fathers, in treating of the text, always interpreted it as an address of the Father to the Son.*

Let us make man.

Observe that it is not one man, but the race, that is here created. This is made evident from the word *man* immediately being expanded into *Let them have dominion*.

Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness :

We will endeavour, first of all, to see what is the exact difference in meaning between *image*, “*tzelem*,” and *likeness*, “*d^emuth*.” That there is a difference may be inferred, not merely from the use of the two different words, but also from their being preceded by two different prepositions, *in* (“*b-*,”) *Our image*, *after* (“*k-*,”) *Our likeness*. Apparently the word “*tzelem*” always denotes the outward appearance of a thing as seen by the eye ; whereas “*d^emuth*” may denote either that outward appearance, or any characteristic in which one thing may resemble another. We must believe, then, that even man’s outward form is, in some wonderful way, capable of showing forth the Divine nature ; and this is confirmed by the passage, *Christ, for in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*. (Colossians ii. 8-9.) In spite of all the humiliation and degradation to which the human body may be subjected, it is in its noblest form capable of setting forth the Divine attributes. *According to our like-*

* E.g. Athanasius, *Contra Gentes*, Sect. 34 ; Second Discourse against the Arians, Chap. 18, Sect. 31 ; and often elsewhere. See note in Wace and Schaff’s edition of the Select Works of S. Athanasius, on *De Synodis*, p. 465, line 6.

ness, will represent those more hidden and spiritual qualities in which man resembles God. The highest of these, and therefore that which is probably specially intended, is undoubtedly the free-will, which gives man a spontaneous or self-originating power, enabling him to control his thoughts, sensations, and motives, and so constituting him a responsible being, separated by an infinite distance from the brute creation. In the two words, *image* and *likeness*, we have the justification of much that is disparaged as “anthropomorphism.” If man is made in the image and after the likeness of God, then God, in all that is beautiful, all that is good, all that is wonderful, must be like unto man. Remove the imperfection, the limitation, and deterioration, from any human quality, and you may safely attribute it to God. Here is indeed a revelation of the Divine name since we started with it only so short a time ago in the first verse of this Book! And be it observed that this representation of the Deity occurs in a part of the Book of Genesis which what is called the “Higher Criticism” speaks of as “the priestly narrative,” and asserts to have been completed after the time of Ezekiel; one of the distinguishing characteristics of which is said to be that the author’s “representations of God are less anthropomorphic than those”* of the other compilers of the Pentateuch. Yet here in this narrative we find the source, the sum, and the justification, of all true and noble anthropomorphism.

and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

So then we have at last arrived at that being who is intended to be “the roof and crown of things.”

V. 27. *And God created man*

Again we must ask the reader to understand that

* Driver’s “Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,” p. 121, line 7, of the second edition.

what was then created was not a man as he now exists, but the energies, capacities, vital forces, and laws of action of those forces, which, working in their appointed course, would in due time produce man as their result. Moreover, we must remember that only the simplest of those forces would begin to emerge directly. The rest would be latent perhaps for long periods, and only gradually come into action in their predestined order, as each inferior force had prepared a suitable basis for the next higher.*

And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him ; male and female created He them.

Thus the distinction between the sexes was constituted from the first ; and whatever differences there might be between them, either in mind or body, both alike were made in the image of God, the grand prerogative of free-will especially being shared by the female no less than the male.

V. 28. *And God blessed them : and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it ; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heaven, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.*

Man was to have the right and the power to alter the surface of the earth in such a way as to make it

* It does not necessarily follow that all the effects of the Creative power were produced in the order in which the several Words of Creation were spoken. The different energies and forces which were brought into being, and began to act when those words were uttered, would very likely not be equally rapid in their action ; and therefore the effects of one that was set in motion later may have appeared sooner than those of another which started earlier. For example, if it can be shown that the creeping thing of the earth appeared sooner than the fowl of the air, while the narrative in Genesis represents the winged fowl as having been created before the beasts of the earth, this would merely show that some of the forces necessary to produce the birds of the air were slower in their operation than those which resulted in the development of the beasts of the earth.

suitable to his own needs and purposes ; whether by cultivation, or mining, or engineering operations, or any other change which would render it more serviceable.

V. 29. *And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed ; to you it shall be for meat :*

V. 30. *And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the heaven, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is living soul (I have given) every green herb for meat :*

There is everything here to lead us to suppose that both man and beast were originally intended to use only vegetable productions for food. The destruction then, of animal life for this purpose, with all the suffering which it entails, was brought in afterwards, and was no part of the original design. As we have suggested already, it was introduced by a malignant enemy, bent, as far as he could, on marring God's work, and paining the Divine heart.

and it was so.

This is the last time that this expression occurs ; and, therefore, this will be a good opportunity for meeting a doubt which is very likely to arise in the mind of anyone who has followed carefully the foregoing explanation of the process of creation. It may be said that the words, *and it was so*, imply that that which God commanded was produced at once, then and there, in all its perfection. For instance, when it is related that God said, *Let the earth put forth grass, etc.*, and we are told directly afterwards that *it was so ; and the earth brought forth grass, etc.* (Genesis i. 11-12) ; it may be argued that the production of the grass and herb and fruit tree in all their maturity must be believed to have taken place as soon as the creative word was spoken. Now let us apply this idea to the last case in which this expression, *it was so*, is used. If it means that that which is described took

place immediately upon the utterance of God's word ; then we must suppose that as soon as He said, *Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, etc., and to every beast of the earth, etc.*, there stood forth at once in visible material existence every kind of edible plant that now exists or ever has existed ; that there stood forth in visible material existence every kind of beast and fowl and creeping animal that exists or has ever existed ; and at least one male and one female to represent the race of man. In fact, we have no right to limit the account to one male and one female, for it is the race that was then made,—*Let us make man, and let them have dominion.* Now, if we even suppose that Adam was immediately created, there is no sense in which Eve was then created, except that she was made in some immature form in him ; for we know as a fact that the woman was not created then and there in perfect mature existence ; nor indeed till some considerable time after, when Adam had not only been put into the garden of Eden, but had been there long enough to survey and name all the beasts of the field one by one. And if we go still further and ask how we ourselves were included in the creative word, we know that it could not have been then that we appeared in visible material existence. It is clear that we could only have been created at that time in some germinal form ; and therefore, the words, *It was so*, must apply to that which did not become matured till ages after the time to which they refer. And there is no reason why that which is true of his descendants should not have been true of Adam himself, namely, that he was really created then and there, but only in some immature form, which it might take ages to develop. The fact is, that although the progress of science was needed to make manifest the true meaning of the sacred narrative, yet that narrative never could, consistently with itself, have been explained by the supposition that everything was created at once, in visible material existence.

V. 31. *And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good.*

It may be asked how God could express this complete satisfaction with His glorious creation when He foresaw, as undoubtedly He did, the terrible evil that the malignant enemy would bring upon it. The answer is, that though, as we have said, the Divine heart was deeply pained by that which He foresaw, God could see also that the time would come when He would completely destroy the works of the Devil, and make His creation even yet more glorious by reason of his permitted outrage. We may feel that we ourselves could have been declared *very good* only because He Who made us would redeem us completely from the power of the Evil, and make us such as He could love with intense delight. Thus, finally, the universe was completed.

And there was evening and there was morning, a sixth day.

CHAPTER II.

THE REST OF GOD.

THE COMING OF MAN WITH HIS ACCOMPANYING FLORA AND FAUNA.

V. 1-3. *And the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And by the seventh day* God finished His work which He had made ; and He ceased with the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it ; because that by it He ceased from all His work which God created so as to make.*

(i.e., Which He made by the particular process which is called Creation.)

These verses are evidently a part of the narrative contained in the first chapter, and ought never to have been separated from it. The second chapter properly begins with verse 4.

The first thing which we must notice here is that the Hebrew word “yishboth” does not imply necessarily or primarily, rest in the sense of being *fatigued*, and therefore needing refreshment, but of *sitting still*, and so ceasing or desisting from a thing. For instance, in the eighth chapter, verse 22, *While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease*, (“yishbothu”).

Secondly, it must be observed that this blessing and hallowing of the seventh day must have been done primarily for the heavenly places and those who dwelt in them, and not for man ; for this first Sabbath must have been celebrated ages before man existed to observe it. We shall see later on how the institution was likely to have become known, and to have been observed on the earth, but we cannot estimate

* See Appendix C, p. 137.

the full importance of the Sabbath unless we understand that it was appointed first of all for the denizens of heaven.

Thirdly, it may be asked whether God has ever resumed the work of creation from which He then desisted, or whether the cessation has continued ever since. According to the Creationist theory, which represents God as creating separately every individual of the vegetable, animal, and human kingdoms, God has been creating incessantly ; and in fact it is hardly conceivable how He could have ceased from creation even on the Sabbath day, for all those species of creatures whose life lasts only for a day must in that case have perished, from not having the opportunity of propagating their kind. But, as we have represented the creation, the first Sabbath,—according to the plain statement of Holy Scripture,—celebrated the conclusion of a work which needed not to be resumed for many long ages. It has been supposed that our Lord's words in S. John, v. 17, *My Father worketh even until now, and I work*, are contrary to this idea.* But God works in other ways besides creation ; and in fact, our Lord's argument against the Jews is, that God co-operated with Him in every work which He did, and therefore, that in charging Him with breaking the Sabbath by working miracles, they were, in fact, making God himself a Sabbath-breaker. But it must be noted that the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ necessitated the introduction into earthly things of a new Divine energy, and therefore, involved an act of creation according to our definition. And that new energy was not confined to the person of Christ, for many bodies of the saints arose and came out of their graves after His Resurrection ; and the same power is represented as working from that time forward in the baptized members of Christ. Thus, in Ephesians, i, 19-20, S. Paul speaks of *the exceeding greatness*

* See Pusey's "Lectures on Daniel," p. xxii of the Preface to the Third Edition.

of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of the strength of His might, which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead. And it is well worthy of note, in corroboration of the belief that there was a renewed action of the creative power in the Resurrection, that it was when S. John *was in the spirit*, not on the Jewish Sabbath, but on the Lord's day, that He had that wondrous vision of the worship of heaven, which is described in the fourth chapter of the Revelation. So it is no far-fetched idea, that on account of the resumption, and mighty exhibition, of creative power in the Resurrection of our Lord, the day of rest was changed in heaven as well as on earth from the seventh day to the first. But the energy just spoken of is, of course, one of which physical science cannot possibly take cognizance; * and as we have seen, those forces of which it can take cognizance were completed in the six days' work, and never afterwards added to. So that we get at once to the scientific law of the conservation of force; which asserts that "the quantity of force which can be brought into action in the whole of nature is unchangeable, and can neither be increased nor diminished." † It is, in fact, unchangeable, until God wills to change it by resuming His work of creation.

Finally, we cannot but feel what a momentous importance this hallowing of the seventh day gives to the great six days' work. As we have seen already, there must have been other creative periods before this, to produce the state of things from which this creation started: but no hint is given that any of them was commemorated by a holy day, until the exercise of the Divine power which culminated in the creation of man was finished. Nay, more; it is most noticeable that the intervals between successive

* It is however conceivable that medical science might detect some trace of its working.

† Helmholtz's Popular Scientific Lectures, Vol. I., p. 280, line 4.

Sabbaths were reckoned by earthly days, and so made to depend upon the revolution of the earth upon its axis. Thus, we might even say that this earth is made a time-piece for Heaven. Nor is this the only indication of the paramount importance of man's earth in the universe of God. From the mention of the Spirit brooding on the face of the earthly ocean, we may infer that the creative fiat, even when, as on the first day and on the fourth, it clearly affected the whole universe, was issued from this earth. Here, too, the age-long struggle between the goodness of God and the malice of God's enemy has been carried on, as its chief battle-field. Yet observe, that though this is so, nothing is said about this earth being central, or conspicuous, in the physical universe. The record nowhere asserts, as it might be supposed to do from the way many talk, that the sun and all the heavenly bodies revolve round the earth, or that its magnitude is very great in comparison with other orbs, or that it is fixed and motionless, instead of rotating on its axis and revolving round the sun, or, in short, that it is in any way of great moment physically amidst the heavenly bodies. Thus, while Pope Urban VIII. with all the religious men of his day was wrong in denying the physical facts which Galileo and the scientific men were bringing to light, they were right in that which led them to this opposition, namely, a profound sense of the paramount importance of this world in the universe of God. The mistake has been made on both sides of confounding spiritual greatness with physical magnitude. We say on both sides, for men are making exactly the same mistake in another way when they argue that because this earth is an insignificant satellite of the sun, therefore the great things which are written of it are absurd, and mere flights of human vanity. There is probably a sense in which even physically the world is perfectly unique. The contention of the late Dr. Whewell, in his "Plurality of Worlds," that as far as we have any

means of judging, there is no world the same as this in its physical conditions, and therefore, no other orb capable of being inhabited by a race of beings at all similar to man, has never been satisfactorily answered ; indeed, his arguments seem to have gained fresh force from the discoveries which have been made since that work was written.* Moreover, we have not yet seen this world in its final condition, and probably when at last *the Tabernacle of God is with men*, we shall discover that it is even physically the centre of the universe.

We have now completed our consideration of the creation of the great six days. It only remains to say something about the Record in which the account of it is contained. We think that no unprejudiced mind can fail to be struck with the simplicity, the grandeur, the beauty, and the almost poetical rhythm of the language of that Record. Moreover it contains a statement of facts which could only have been known originally to God and the holy angels. If then that Record be an authentic one, it must have proceeded from God. Whether the Divine Being did Himself compose it, or whether He commissioned and inspired an angel to do so, we have a narrative of which God Himself is the Author. Furthermore, it must be noticed that, as far as we can judge, this narrative has not suffered by intentional† alteration in the process of transmission. The various readings in the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint exemplars are of the most unimportant description, not affecting in any way the sense or even the phraseology of the account, and consisting principally of the repetition or transposition of one or two

* The well-known scientist, Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace, has recently published a book entitled "Man's Place in the Universe," in which he brings an entirely new line of argument to prove that the balance of scientific probability is against the idea of there being any other world in the physical universe inhabited by living persons, but our own.

† However, see Appendix C, p. 137.

phrases in the Septuagint and Samaritan as compared with the Hebrew ; so that we have the record virtually as it proceeded from the mind of the Author.

And what is the alternative which is offered to us ? We are asked to believe that a priest, or company or generation of priests, with nothing more to go upon than a general belief that God created all things, and the established practice of a constantly recurring seventh day rest, about the year 600 B.C., out of vague popular conceptions, derived originally from grotesque Babylonian mythological inventions,* eked out by their own unscientific imaginings, fabricated, and induced a credulous people to receive as authentic, the Record of the creation which we have before us. This being so, we must further believe that, if there is any truth in the foregoing explanation of it, the Record having this unpromising origin, after remaining for about twenty-five centuries simply a beautiful fable, has finally proved to be not only compatible with the most advanced theories of modern science, but even to have a new light thrown upon it, and a new force given to it, by their assistance. The mere statement of this supposition seems sufficient to prove its incredibility ; and if the New Criticism is thus shown to fail on its first application, can we expect that it will be more successful in its onward progress ?

V. 4. *These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created, in the day (Jehovah) God made earth and heaven.*

The phrase with which this verse begins, *These are the generations of*, is one which keeps recurring in the Book of Genesis, as a sort of heading to the different portions of which the book is composed, and it occurs nowhere else exactly in the same sense. The only other place where it may possibly have the same meaning is in Numbers iii. 1. ; yet even there it is

* See Dr. Driver's "Genesis," pp. 26-31.

clear that the object of the writer is to state who were the members of the priestly family then alive, rather than to record their doings.; while in Genesis it appears to be equivalent to *These are the annals of*——. We think that it may be inferred that the use of this phrase was archaic, and died out after the time of Moses. Probably it came from the hand of the original author of each section to which it is prefixed, whom therefore we may conclude to have lived before the time of Moses; who these different authors were we may be able to discover as we go on. This heading is not followed by a continuous history of the period to which it refers; but the writer selects certain events which belong to that period, sometimes a genealogy of persons who lived in it, together with short notices respecting them, and at other times a more or less connected narrative of a succession of events. In the present instance the title has been supposed to refer to the account of the Creation which precedes it; but elsewhere it always forms an introduction to what follows, and there seems no sufficient reason for imagining a departure from the ordinary usage here. In the Hebrew language the phrase “in the day” means “in the time when,” and may denote not only the time in which the events referred to occurred, but also the period after their recurrence. Thus, although the words *God made earth and heaven*, must refer to the Creation described in the previous chapter, yet, *these are the generations of* can very properly form the heading to an account of subsequent events.* They may be paraphrased as

* An instance of a similar construction is found in Numbers vii, 1-2 (A.V.). *And it came to pass “on the day that” Moses had fully set up the Tabernacle and anointed it, . . . that the princes of Israel . . . offered.* And in v. 10, *The princes offered for the dedicating of the altar “in the day that” it was anointed, . . . their offering before the altar.* It might be supposed from these words that the offering made by the princes took place at the time when the Tabernacle was set up and anointed; but as a matter of

follows: "When God thus created man's earth and heaven, this is an account of some of the events which took place in them."

But the verse we are considering contains one word which occasions a far more serious difficulty, namely, the peculiar designation of the God of Israel—Jehovah.* This is the first place in the Bible where that name occurs, and the difficulty is to account for its appearance here. In the third chapter of Exodus, which describes the most momentous event of Moses' life, his being commissioned by the Almighty to undertake the magnificent work which he afterwards accomplished, he asks, *Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, What is His name? what shall I say unto them?* And then it was that, obviously for the first time, God revealed Himself under this new name. *God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.* (Exodus iii. 13-14.) Now this word I AM, literally, "I shall be," implying

fact it was made on the twelve succeeding days, as the verses which follow show, and in verse 88 it is expressly said, *This was the dedication of the altar, "after that" it was anointed.* Again, we read in II. Samuel xxii. 1 (R.V.). *And David spake unto the Lord the words of this song "in the day that" the Lord delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies, and out of the hand of Saul.* Of course we are not to suppose that David sat down and wrote this psalm directly after he had overcome his last enemy, but that some time afterwards, when everything was going well with him, the thought of all the goodness which God had shown him came forcibly into his mind, and called forth this song of exultant gratitude.

The explanation of this idiom lies in the fact that the Hebrew possesses no pluperfect tense, and therefore frequently uses the preter to express it.

* The proper pronunciation of the Hebrew word which we call Jehovah is probably "Yahveh," but we have not thought it necessary to perplex the English reader by employing a name with which he is unfamiliar.

eternal existence, is the root of the word “Yahveh,” which we represent by “Jehovah.” Indeed, directly after, in the fifteenth verse, God says to Moses, *Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you : this is My name for ever, and this is My memorial unto all generations.* We think that no one who reads this passage can hesitate to believe that God here revealed Himself under a new name, used then for the first time. But to remove all doubt about the matter let us refer to another passage in Exodus vi. 2-3, where, in another great crisis of Moses’ life, when at first his mission to Pharaoh seemed utterly to have failed, and to have brought only fresh trouble to his people, he is comforted by a further declaration of this significant name. *God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am JEHOVAH : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty, (El Shaddai), but by My name JEHOVAH I was not known to them.* (Exodus vi. 2-3.) This seems to make it clear that in His communications with the ancestors of the Israelites, He had not used the name Jehovah, but was now giving it as a special privilege to Moses and his people. It appears to us that when Biblical critics, whatever be their views, attempt to set aside, or explain away such words as these, they cannot but be chargeable with a mischievous tampering with Holy Scripture. But that being so, there can be only one explanation of the occurrence of this name in the Book of Genesis. If there were any contemporaneous records, either written or oral, on which the book was founded, those records could not, in their original form, have contained the name Jehovah, and therefore it must have been either inserted, or substituted for some other word, after the above revelations were given to Moses.* We need hardly add that if

* On this account we have bracketed the word “Jehovah” wherever it occurs in the Book of Genesis.

there were no contemporaneous records, either written or oral, the whole history can be only regarded as fiction.

To return to the verse on which we are commenting, apparently the word “Jehovah” has been inserted there without any other change, in perfect good faith : it is employed throughout the remainder of the second chapter, and the whole of the third. The inserter, whoever he was, (most likely he was not the original author of the verse), wished to make it clear that the God Who had created heaven and earth was none other than Jehovah, the God of Israel ; which was perfectly true, and no alteration of the sense. The reason why he did not make the insertion in the record of creation itself, probably was because that document was held in too much veneration to admit of its being altered in any way.

Between the period referred to in this verse and the succeeding verse, there is an immense lapse of time. The geological ages have run their course ; plants and animals have been developed in ever-ascending scale, from the lowest germs to vegetable productions of all kinds, except those which only appeared just before the coming of man ; and the animal kingdom has attained to some anthropoid creature probably not differing greatly in body and in outward appearance from man himself. All this is passed over in silence, but at length the veil is raised again, and we find a state of things in some respects unexpected disclosed in the next verse.

V. 5. *Now no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, no herb of the field had yet sprung up : for (Jehovah) God did not cause it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.*

The Hebrew word “syach,” which our translators have rendered “plant” and the Septuagint “green thing,” is rightly translated in the Vulgate by “virgultum,” and does not mean vegetable productions generally, but a “shrub” or “bush.” It occurs

only in four places in the Bible, and of these two are in Genesis. One is the present verse, and the other is in xxi. 15, where it is used of the shrub or bush under which Hagar threw down Ishmael, when she was too much exhausted to drag him on any further. Let it be observed, then, that we are not here told that no vegetable production had yet appeared in visible existence, but only that no "shrub" had appeared. Moreover the expression is further limited to a particular kind or kinds of shrubs, by the addition of the words "of the field," by the statement that one reason why it could not appear was the want of rain, and by the additional circumstance that it needed man's care. Now "the field,"—Hebrew "sadeh,"—is not ground generally, but ground connected with man, as being possessed or tilled, or at any rate hunted over or traversed by him. Joining this with the fact that it was the want of man to till the ground that had delayed the production of this kind of bush or shrub, we must infer that what is here meant is such shrubs as require and repay man's cultivation, that is to say, ornamental shrubs, and those producing fruit.

The *herb* we have had before : *And the earth brought forth . . . herb yielding seed after its kind.* (Genesis i. 12.) The word denotes, as we there explained, herbs fit for the food of man, and especially the cereals. These too, like the former class, are in the present verse called *herb of the field*, as being grown in ground cultivated by man. These vegetable productions then had not yet sprung up ; their final development was delayed by the two circumstances that " (Jehovah) God did not cause it to rain upon the earth," and that man had not appeared. It is not said that it had never rained hitherto, and indeed there is evidence of there having been copious rain in some of the geological ages. All that we are entitled to infer from what is here said, is that there had been from some cause, for we know not how long, a cessation of rain on that particular tract in which the vegetable

productions in question were destined to appear. Can we give a reasonable surmise as to what that cause may have been? We offer the suggestion that this part of the world was going through a glacial period, during which the earth beneath and the heaven above were spell-bound by the icy finger of intense frost. But underneath the soil, hidden by the veil of ice, there were the seeds of plants in which, all the more because they were cut off from outward activity, changes were going on, a final development which would in due time manifest itself, when the icy shroud was removed. At length, we know not by what means, the drought came to an end.

V. 6. *And there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.*

If our suggestion is correct, this of course is exactly what would take place at the end of a glacial period. As it passed away, copious vaporous exhalations would rise from the melting ice, and return again in due time in the form of rain.

The second obstacle to the production and preservation of the vegetable forms in question was now to be removed.

V. 7. *(Jehovah) God formed man, dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.*

Probably there has been a stage in the Bible-reading of most of us when the idea that these words suggested to our minds, was that God took dust or loam, and moulded it into something like the likeness of a man, and then put life into this lifeless image, and thus constituted a man with a living soul; and we are afraid that there are not a few who have never got beyond this gross and unworthy conception. This idea is so far true that the solid matter of the body is composed of what may be rightly called earth (Hebrew “*adamah*”), and probably from this fact Adam derived his name. In reality the terms of the verse merely express that which the Semitic monotheists believed of the formation and birth of every child. If, in the passage before us,

it is said *God formed man*, we find in Jeremiah i. 5, *Before I formed thee in the belly*, and the word for “form” is the same word as in the text. If it says, *God formed man, dust from the ground*, Bildad, in Job viii. 19, alluding to the way in which men succeed one another, uses the expression, *Out of the dust shall others spring*. So again we have in Psalm ciii. 14, *He remembereth that we are dust*.* Again, if it is said in the text, *God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life*, He is spoken of in Isaiah xlii. 5, as *He that giveth breath unto the people*; and similarly S. Paul speaks of God as giving *to all life, and breath, and all things*. (Acts xvii. 25.) † So that there is nothing in the expressions here used which indicates that Adam was produced in any different way from an ordinary child. If the watery matter of the body be taken away, the solid part consists of earthy and other salts, iron, and a few of the most commonly diffused chemical elements, all of which, by a writer not aiming at scientific accuracy, might well be described as *dust from the earth*. But it is often assumed by believers, not less than sceptics, that the representation of the Almighty as directly intervening in the growth and birth of a child is merely a mode of speech accommodated to the unscientific ideas of the Hebrew or Semitic people, and must now be regarded as a fancy to which no reality corresponds. But the question is whether it is not we who have erred in our notions, and whether the Semite believed what he did, because he had been taught of God what was no rude or unscientific imagination, but the absolute truth? Why should we not credit the plain testimony of Holy Scripture that the power which forms the infant in the womb, however it may be regulated by certain laws and conditions which God Himself has imposed upon it, is yet His own power, put forth directly by Himself, then

* See also Job x. 8-11.

† Compare also Ps. cxxxix. 13-16.

and there ? Why do we find it hard to believe that He, by a direct and incessant exertion of energy, gives to the lungs and maintains in them as long as they continue to act, that vital power by which they draw in the breath of heaven ? So that the words of the Apostle are literally true : *In Him we live, and move, and have our being.*

As the result of God's thus breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, we are told—

and man became a living soul.

Apparently we may infer from this that the child has no conscious sensation—although he undoubtedly has sensitiveness—that is, motion excited by stimuli—until he draws his first breath. But there is something most worthy of notice still remaining to be pointed out in this description of the formation and birth of a child. Very wonderful it seems at first sight, that there is nothing in it which implies that the being thus produced had any special human prerogative. It is often supposed by those who have not studied the matter with any care, that the words, *living soul* express what is peculiar to man. But the reader who has followed us attentively in our explanation of the creation of the lower animals as given in the first chapter of Genesis, will remember that exactly the same expression is there used of them. We have then, the totally unexpected fact that the description of the formation of man contained in the passage now under consideration leaves him nothing better than an animal. How are we to account for this ? The answer is a strong proof that the explanation we have been giving is the true one, and that any other which represents God as creating a full-grown man, fails ; because such a creation must have been one, not of a mere animal, but of a man with all human prerogatives. But the formation and birth of a child produces, as any intelligent mother well knows, merely an engaging little animal. The age at which the truly human prerogatives of free-will and self-control begin

to show themselves probably varies in different children, but seems in no case to be until they have completed their third year ; so that we have here a remarkable testimony to the perfect accuracy of the narrative in Genesis.

We must now revert to the progenitors of the first man. We may believe that the line of progress from the germ to man's immediate ancestors had been watched with an evil eye by the enemy of God, as soon as he discerned that there was some high destiny intended for it, different from that which was to be fulfilled by the other races. We may be sure that it was no less jealously guarded and tended by the holy angels. Hence we may suppose, that when that line finally resulted in the immediate progenitors of man, they consisted of a strong but unaggressive race of creatures, gregarious and vegetarian. Probably they were monogamous, and their habits, though of course animal, need not be vicious or malevolent. There might be allied races which were carnivorous and quarrelsome, but those we are speaking of, while superior strength and ability kept them secure, would have a mildness of disposition which rendered them harmless. Probably, as we have said, they were anthropoid animals differing little in outward appearance from man himself, and as regards internal structure, only differing, it may be, by having one or two convolutions of the brain not yet developed, and particularly by those changes in it which were necessary to render possible the production of articulate speech, not being yet effected. It is impossible to say how far this race and the allied species may have been able to progress in the use of instruments ; but if we allow them to have possessed human form, it seems probable that the power which the shape of the hand confers would not have been entirely unutilized. There appears to be no reason why some of these predecessors of Adam should not have made flint weapons and tools, hunted the mammoth and other animals

existing in their age, and even have scratched outline representations of those animals on the walls of the caves in which they dwelt.

Animals, as we know them, exhibit wonderful perseverance, patience, and endurance in effecting what they wish to accomplish, have strong powers of imagination, as shown by their dreaming, very retentive memories, a capacity for mimicry, and great general intelligence and sagacity, enabling them frequently to effect things which it is out of our power to explain. It appears therefore very possible that man-like animals may have succeeded in doing all that can with certainty be ascribed to paleolithic man, without possessing the truly human prerogative of free will, which enables him to control his thoughts, sensations, and motives, and so constitutes him a responsible being.

Now, suppose a glacial period gradually to come on with constantly increasing rigour in the region inhabited by this race. The conditions of life would be more and more severe ; the weaker members of the family would die out, till at last, by the law of the survival of the fittest, there would remain none but a few of the strongest, most capable, and most clever of the race. Possibly they may have been reduced at last only to a single pair, who maintained themselves by having discovered some peculiarly favoured spot, where the presence of hot springs or volcanic fires produced an oasis of vegetable life around. Here they may have struggled on amid great privation, till at last, quite unexpectedly things began to mend. The rigid veil of ice which covered the land suddenly broke up, the glacial conditions passed away, and they found themselves surrounded with everything that would make their life a blessing instead of a burden to them. Under such circumstances we may suppose the long-expected child, the destined lord of the earth, was born. With what anxiety it may be imagined was his coming looked for both in heaven and on earth ! In this

child, the final development must be supposed to have taken place;—there came forth a man, made in the image of God. How long was this human child suffered to remain with his animal parents? We have several considerations to guide us in some degree in answering this question. We should suppose that the child was left with its mother as long as it needed a mother's peculiar care, and until it was capable of eating vegetable food. Probably two years would be sufficient for this. On the other hand the child would not be left with its parents beyond the time when they would naturally expect him to shift for himself. This could hardly be later than four years old. There would be the further consideration that it would scarcely be safe for him to be left with them when he began to show signs of the possession of purely human prerogatives. This again, if we may learn anything from the analogy of ordinary infants, might be about four years of age. On the whole, it seems probable that at any rate before he entered his fifth year, the child would have to be provided for by heavenly guardians.* Whether the race of progenitors was continued apart from him, or whether, as seems most likely, they were suffered having done their work to die out peacefully, we cannot tell, but the latter supposition seems by far the more probable.

What became of the wondrous child? We may suppose that he had derived a splendid constitution, and probably remarkable personal beauty, from his parents, natural abilities sharpened to their utmost capacity by the struggles and hardships which they had had to undergo, and a disposition like theirs, strong and yet innocent; and there was superimposed upon all this the truly human qualities of free-will, self-consciousness, and self-control. For such a child, with such a destiny, there needed a special education to render him suitable for his grand position, and

* See Preface to the second volume of this work.

such an education could apparently best be supplied by removing him to one of the *many mansions* of his Heavenly *Father's house*. There, amid the society of angels, admitted sometimes to the presence of God Himself, he would, from the first, have that acquaintance with the supernatural, which has been so stamped through him upon the human race, that it is impossible for any man, however much he may wish to do so, to divest himself of it altogether. Here he would join in the observance and worship of the Heavenly Sabbath, and here too, he would be taught all that it was good for him to know about God's doings in the past, and what He intended to do in the future. For him probably, the Record of the Creation was drawn up, and firmly implanted upon his memory, and he would be warned that there was an enemy of God, a spoiler of His work, of whom he would have to beware. His high destiny as the father of mankind, and some information as to the social organization of his descendants, as forming families, races, and nations, would be given him, and probably some intimation would be afforded him that God Himself would, in the fulness of time, share the human nature derived from him. Naturally, he would be trained also for the work on earth in which he was first to be occupied. There would be a heavenly Paradise provided, in which he could be instructed in the principles of earthly agriculture ; and in whatever else was necessary for him to know as a preparation for his terrestrial existence.

All this, no doubt, he would learn ultimately ; but his first lesson would be how to express himself in articulate language. It seems most improbable that a new form of speech would be invented for his especial use ; the conclusion therefore is inevitable that he must have been taught the language of heaven, and that this was the language which he brought with him when he returned to earth, and which became the original speech of mankind. From the very nature

of the case it is certain that this primeval language could not have been a rudimentary form of speech, consisting only of roots from which a more perfect medium of communication could by degrees be built up, but must have been originally a noble vehicle of thought, systematically constructed, complete in every part, and capable of expressing every idea which Divine and angelic natures might wish to convey to each other.*

How long would Adam's training go on? Little as we may expect it at first sight, we seem to have the means of approximately answering this question. We know that when he arrived on earth, Adam was a full-grown man of ripe maturity for marriage. What information then, have we as to the marriageable age at that time? We do not know at what age Adam's first son was born; we are only told with regard to his third son, that Adam *lived an hundred and thirty years and begat a son*. (Genesis v. 3.) But here a further difficulty meets us. The dates of the genealogy of the descendants of Adam, as given in the fifth chapter of Genesis, differ in the Septuagint from those in the Hebrew; and the Samaritan

* We have endeavoured to show in the second volume of this work, pp. 85-87, that when before the Dispersion *the whole earth was of one lip and of one language*, that speech was the most ancient form of the Semitic, and must have come down from Adam; so that from it all the languages of the earth have been derived. We do not think that in the present advanced state of philology, any careful and cautious student of that science would venture to affirm that this could not have been the case. This was the universal belief of the Fathers, Doctors and Theologians of the Church, till a comparatively recent time. It was the great Leibnitz who, at the beginning of the 18th century, first asserted that Hebrew was only a branch of the primitive language of mankind; but he gave no convincing proof of his assertion. It is of course possible that the language spoken before the Dispersion may not have been Semitic, and that the Hebrew or the Arabic took their origin, like other languages, from the Confusion of Tongues. But we think the probability is the other way.

version, while agreeing in the main with the Hebrew, in some places differs from both. We shall have to return to this subject further on ; we will only say now that the age of at least a hundred would appear to be a reasonable date to fix for Adam's maturity. How ample then was the period allowed for his celestial education.

But at length the time appointed of the Father fully arrived that the heir of the world should leave his heavenly home, and enter upon his earthly career. Meanwhile a place had been prepared for him, where, with every advantage, he might begin his work.

V. 8. *And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden ; and there He put the man whom He had formed.**

The second obstacle which had stood in the way of the production of the fruits of the earth in the final and perfect form had been removed. There was now *a man to till the ground.*

V. 9. *And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food ; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.*

It is clear that our word " garden " conveys no true idea of what is here meant. It was an enclosure spacious enough to admit of a very large river flowing through it, and to have *every beast of the field and every fowl of the air* living in it. It was, in fact, what the Greeks learnt from the Persians to call a "Paradise," the nearest approach to which in our language is " park." Such a park would contain plantations of trees, all kinds of coverts for wild animals, and space for them

* It seems to be almost too obvious to be worth noting that, when the Almighty is said to have formed, planted, put, took, and done other acts, we need not suppose that He did not employ subsidiary agencies to carry out His intentions, were it not for the fact that Dr. Driver calls all such expressions "anthropomorphic," and appears to suggest that the writer spoke of God as doing all these things with His own hands. ("The Book of Genesis," p. 20.)

to roam at large, besides cultivated fields and gardens. We shall see a little later what the limits of this garden probably were. It was situated in Eden, a Hebrew word which means "delight." No doubt the name was given to that land after Adam had been expelled from the garden, not merely in memory of that delightful abode, but also because the country in which it was situated would be delightful in climate, and in its productions. As for the Paradise itself, how beautiful must have been the pleasaunce which the Lord God Himself designed, and of which the angels were the landscape gardeners. No doubt also, a suitable residence was provided for the master; and here, when all was ready, the Lord God *put the man whom He had formed*. What a day of rejoicing and yet of anxiety it must have been when Adam left his heavenly home to take possession of his dominion upon earth! To compare great things with small, it was like the son of a king, now come fully of age, setting forth amidst universal acclamations to undertake as viceroy the government of some splendid country in a distant portion of his father's empire. What a day of joy, and yet of anxiety too; for who but God Himself could foresee whether the heir would prove fit for his office?

We have still to call special attention to one word in the eighth verse, *And (Jehovah) God planted a garden "eastward" in Eden*. As long as Adam and his descendants were living in the neighbourhood of Paradise, the garden could not be described as being situated *eastward*; indeed, we find that when Adam was expelled from the garden, he and his posterity must have lived on the east side of it, for we are told that *Jehovah placed at the east of the garden of Eden, the cherubim and the flame of a sword* to prevent return thither (Genesis iii. 24). The locality of the garden could only have been described as lying to the east by one who at the time was living some considerable distance to the west of it. And this is not the only indication that the description which defines the locality

of the garden was added by a later hand ; for we read—

V. 10. *And a river went out of Eden to water the garden and from thence it was parted and became four heads.*

Eden, as we have said, was probably the original name of the district in which the garden was situated ; and so persistently did that name cling to some portion of this region, that we find mention of Eden, apparently somewhere in that neighbourhood, as late as the time of the prophet Ezekiel (Ezekiel xxvii. 23). There is no reason then why we should not regard verse 10 as part of the original narrative ; but when it is added—

V. 11. *The name of the first (head) is Pishon : that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah,* we become conscious of a later addition. This is also the case when we read in the thirteenth verse, *the name of the second river is Gihon : the same is it which compasseth the whole land of Cush ;* and in the fourteenth verse, *and the name of the third river is Hiddekel : that is it which goeth in front of Assyria.* For the names Havilah, Cush, and Assyria, could only have been given after the dispersion of mankind recorded in the tenth chapter of Genesis. The first of these derived its name from Havilah, the son of Cush ; Cush, who gave the name to the second country, was the son of Ham ; and similarly Asshur, from whom Assyria was named, was the son of Shem. Putting these facts together, with the hint derived from the word *eastward*, we can hardly fail to draw the conclusion that the description of the locality of the garden was added at a later time, by some one who knew accurately where tradition placed it, and was acquainted with the neighbouring countries, but who himself lived a good way to the west of those countries. The person who would best fulfil these conditions may become apparent later on.*

* See Part III., pp. 121-122.

To return to verse 10, *A river went out of Eden to water the garden.* Evidently the river entered the garden from the surrounding country in one channel, but *from thence it was parted and became four heads.* If this stood alone, it might seem as if it was when the stream had left the garden on its downward course, that it separated into four rivers. The word *heads* would then mean the different points where the rivers parted from the main stream; and this is the view which the commentators have generally taken of the passage. In that case, in order that the river of Paradise might be the source of four rivers, of which the Tigris and Euphrates were two, Paradise must have been situated far up in the mountains of Armenia; and in fact two of the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates are said to be not more than two or three miles from each other. So that it is quite possible that the Euphrates, like the Tigris, may at one time have had its source in the high mountain lake called Göljik, and that the river of Paradise might have run down from this lake. But besides the difficulty of bringing two other considerable rivers, the Pishon and the Gihon, to the same point, there is the fatal objection that it is certain that the country of Havilah which was encompassed by the Pishon, and probably that the country of Cush which was encompassed by the Gihon, could not have been anywhere in that neighbourhood. In fact, those who take this view of the question find themselves in such inextricable difficulties that they are pretty sure to end in treating the whole story as unauthentic or mythical. Let us then look at the description of the rivers a little more closely. *A river went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted and became four heads. The name of the first is Pishon.* Of the first what? Clearly *head*. The river Pishon itself then is called a *head*. Of what then was it the head? Evidently of the stream flowing through Paradise. We shall discover the four rivers, therefore, by ascending

that stream to the point where it flows into the garden ; and then, at once, most of the difficulties disappear. For at the present time the Tigris and Euphrates form a junction at a place called Kurnah, and thenceforth pursue their course in one channel to the sea ; we must look for Paradise then somewhere between Kurnah and the sea. But again, what other rivers are there that flow into this united channel ? We find that the river Choaspes, now called Kerkhah, enters it at no considerable distance below Kurnah ; and further down, the Passitigris, now called the Karun, joins the channel of the other three, and is the last river which does so before that channel enters the sea. Here, then, we have four rivers, in the right position to represent the four head streams of the river of Paradise, and, accordingly, Paradise itself must have lain between the Karun and the sea. The distance at the present time is about forty miles, which leaves ample room for such a garden as we have described.

To continue our consideration of the four rivers ; ascending the united stream, which is now called Shatt-al-Arab, from the sea, we come first to the Pishon. This name, together with that of the Gihon, has been lost for ages, and there is no other mention of them except in a passage of Ecclesiasticus (xxiv. 25), where they are referred to in the form (which is used here in the Septuagint) of Phison and Geon, in association with the Tigris, Euphrates and Jordan. The writer alludes to the Phison and the Geon in such a way as to lead one to suppose that he was acquainted with these rivers, and aware of their peculiarities as to their times of being in flood ; but he says nothing which will throw any light upon their position. We have identified the Phison with the river called anciently Passitigris, and in modern times, Karun. We are told of it *that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah*, and we must now endeavour to determine from other notices, where that land lay. Two Havilahs are mentioned in the genealogies of the descendants of

Noah ; one the son of Cush and grandson of Ham, the other the son of Joktan, a descendant of Shem. The latter Havilah is supposed to have given his name to Khawlan, a district lying on the west coast of Arabia, in what is called the Yemen. We think this identification very doubtful, but at any rate, if there were a Havilah in the supposed situation, it could have nothing to do with the Havilah mentioned in the passage we are considering ; for the rivers of Paradise could not possibly have been anywhere near it. On the other hand, the former Havilah being a son of Cush, there is no improbability in a country deriving its name from him being adjacent to the country of Cush. We have, besides, a notice which defines its position more clearly. It is in Genesis xxv. 18, where we are told that the descendants of Ishmael *dwelt from Havilah unto Shur that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria*, that is to say, starting from Egypt to go to Assyria, the route leads almost immediately to Shur, and if the journey be continued eastwards across Arabia, Havilah is reached as the extremity of the country inhabited by the Ishmaelites. Now Shur is generally placed somewhere near the position of Suez ; and crossing Arabia eastward through the district occupied by the descendants of Ishmael, we come to the head of the Persian Gulf. So that as Shur, though not itself Arabian, was the starting-point of the Arab tribes, we may conclude that Havilah was the furthest country in the east to which their migrations extended. This would exactly suit the situation to the east of the Shatt-al-Arab,—by which the Tigris and Euphrates empty themselves in the Persian Gulf,—as the name itself, which means *Stream of the Arabs*, seems to imply. We may say then, that it was a country bounded by the Shatt-al-Arab and the Karun on the west, encompassed by the Karun on the north, shut in by the Bakhtiyari mountains on the east, and by the eastern portion of the head of the Persian Gulf on the south.

To continue the quotation, “ Havilah ” :

V. 12. *Where there is gold ; and the gold of that land is good : the bedolach and the onyx stone are there.*

With regard to two of these productions of the country, gold and the onyx stone, we have no other notice of their being found in the land of Havilah ; but we have no doubt that if diligent search were made, traces of their original existence might still be discovered there. The country which we have identified with that land is apparently very little known, except the part adjacent to the river Karun. It is at present inhabited by nomads of mixed Arab and Persian blood, who possess large flocks of sheep, goats and asses.* Such people are not likely to develop, or even to be aware of, the mineral resources of the country. With regard to “ the bedolach ” the case is different. It is doubtful what this word represents, but it is mentioned elsewhere in such a way as to enable us to identify it pretty certainly. In Numbers, xi. 7, we are told that *the manna was like coriander seed, and the appearance thereof as the appearance of the bedolach*. Now the coriander seed we know, is about the size of a small peppercorn, but its colour is light brown, and in Exodus xvi. 31, we read that the manna was *like coriander seed, white*, that is to say, it would resemble the coriander seed in its form, but differed from it in being white. Therefore it is that, in the passage of Numbers, the manna is described as *like coriander seed*, but its appearance *as the appearance of the bedolach*. We conclude then, that the bedolach was a small, round thing, white, like hoar frost, to which also the manna is compared (Exodus xvi. 14). Now this description applies exactly to the pearl, so that we infer that the pearl was found in Havilah ; which agrees with the situation we have assigned to

* See Curzon's “ Persia,” Vol. II., pp. 327-344.

it at the Eastern part of the head of the Persian Gulf, in which pearl fishing goes on to the present day.*

Proceeding up the Shatt-al-Arab, we come to the second head of the river of Paradise.

V. 13. *And the name of the second river is Gihon :*

We have identified this with the ancient Choaspes, now called Kerkhah, which enters the united streams of the Tigris and Euphrates, about five miles below their junction.

the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Cush.

We have therefore to consider where the land of Cush was situated. There can be little doubt that in all the other passages of Scripture where the name occurs, it is applied to a country corresponding pretty nearly with Abyssinia in Africa. Yet there is good reason for believing that this was not the original land of the Cushites ; for not only was Havilah, whose territory we have given reason to suppose was on the Persian Gulf, a son of Cush, but Nimrod, the most mighty of the children of Cush, hunted and built in the land of Shinar, which was between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, at the lower part of their courses. It is clear then, that the Cushites were settled first of all in the neighbourhood of the rivers of Paradise : but as, in this case, we have no other mention of the country, instead of using the country to help the determination of the position of the river, we must use the river to define the situation of the country. If then the whole land of Cush was compassed by the Gihon, and the Gihon may be identified with the

* Apparently the only place in the Persian Gulf where pearl fishing is carried on at the present time is the island of Bahrein, which is on the western side of the Gulf. But the pearl oyster is diffused pretty widely in the neighbouring seas, and is obtained, for example, at Kurrachee, not far from the eastern extremity of the Persian Gulf, at Ceylon, and on the Coromandel coast ; so that there is no improbability of its having been found at an earlier time at the eastern part of the head of the Persian Gulf.

Choaspes, or Kerkhah, we arrive at the conclusion that Cush was the territory lying between the Karun and the Kerkhah, and bounded on the north and east by the Bakhtiyari mountains.

V. 14. *And the name of the third river is Hiddekel : that is it which goeth east of Assyria.*

There has never been any doubt as to this river being the Tigris ; and Assyria, though its boundaries may have been enlarged at times by conquest, was primarily a country lying between the Tigris and Euphrates, in the northern part of their course.

And the fourth river is Euphrates.

It is observable that the Euphrates is assumed to be so well-known that no description need be given of its locality. If, as we have supposed, the writer of this account was one who was settled to the west of the Euphrates, he would have no need to explain the position of that river to his descendants ; for this river was always well-known to the inhabitants of Syria. A considerable traffic was carried on between them and the principal towns situate on it ; and it was the only large river, except the Nile, with which they were acquainted ; so that it was called by them the Great River, or simply *the River* (see Genesis xv. 18, and Exodus xxiii. 31.)

We have now completed our attempt to define the position of the Garden of Eden, but we have left to the last the consideration of an objection which, unless it could be removed, would render the locality which we have assigned to it an impossible one. In consequence of the deposits brought down by the Tigris and Euphrates, the land at the head of the Persian Gulf is perpetually encroaching on the sea, and the gain during the last thousand years has been ascertained to be about twenty miles, that is to say an average of a mile in fifty years.* As the point where the Karun now joins the Shatt-al-Arab is only about

* See the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society" for January and April, 1895, page 300.

forty miles from the sea, it may be inferred that, in the very ancient times we are dealing with, say, about ten thousand years ago, the land in which we have placed Paradise must have been under the sea. But we think that a satisfactory answer can be given to this difficulty. The delightful land of Eden has now become a malarious tract of swamps and marshes, reeds and rushes. What has occurred to produce the change? There is clearly one thing which would cause it effectually—a subsidence of the land since the time when the country was named Eden. Such an alteration of the level would counteract the effect of the deposit brought down by the rivers in raising the country, and so would destroy the value of all such calculations. Such a subsidence, geologists are beginning to think, probably occurred in the great catastrophe of the Deluge; and we may suppose that when that disturbance ceased, the Persian Gulf extended to a considerable distance northward of the present junction of the Tigris and Euphrates. The sea has been gradually pushed back ever since till now it occupies apparently the same position as it did in the time of Paradise. At present the river Karun, which we have identified with the Pishon, flows partly into the sea at a point about twelve miles distant from the mouth of the Shatt-al-Arab, and partly flows into the Shatt-al-Arab by an artificial channel which appears to have been constructed about the middle of the ninth century A.D.* But the subsidence of the ground must have so altered the levels, that the four rivers of Paradise may very well originally have fallen into each other, though not at the same points, nor by precisely the same channels as they do now.

We must now return to verse 9, *And out of the ground made (Jehovah) God to grow every tree . . . ; the tree of life also, in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.* What was the

* See the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," page 308.

purpose of the tree of life ? We read later on that there was a danger lest man after his fall should *take of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever* (Genesis iii.22). This seems to show that the life that was to be maintained by the tree included the bodily life. Hence we infer that Adam would not have lived for ever as regards the body, unless his life had been supported by eating of this tree. In fact we can hardly be wrong in supposing that Adam's body was like our own in being liable to death through privation, violence, and accident ; and possibly as the effect of old age, though probably not of disease. He was capable of sleep (Genesis ii. 21), and therefore we may suppose that he needed the refreshment of sleep. He was to take freely of food (ii. 16), and therefore he must have needed food. And lastly, the tree of life was necessary for his preservation, and so we may infer that he needed a special kind of food to preserve him from the natural decay incidental to age. This tree was therefore planted in the midst of the garden, in order that, as men multiplied, it might be as accessible as possible from all parts ; and as man's original constitution was so good that even when deprived of this tree he could live nearly a thousand years, we may suppose that if he had been able to partake of the tree of life he need never have known death at all.

The mention of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is, if possible, still more significant ; for it shows that during the man's life before (Jehovah) God put him in Paradise, he had never been tempted ; and had therefore no opportunity of choosing between good and evil. During his heavenly existence we have supposed that he had learnt about an enemy of God, against whom he was warned. But we may infer that through the whole of that time he was carefully guarded, so that the evil one touched him not. Now, however, his probation was to begin. God had created him with a free will, and he could not attain his true

perfection unless he was good and pure by choice and not by necessity. Therefore

V. 15. (*Jehovah*) *God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.*

Not merely “to dress it,” but also “to keep it,” that is, to guard it, which implies the propinquity of someone watching to do mischief.

V. 16-17. *And (Jehovah) God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat : but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*

The garden and its inhabitants were to be the starting-point, both as regards vegetable and animal life, of a better order of things, which should gradually spread over the whole earth, and reclaim it from the havoc, the waste, and the useless and deleterious productions, which the malice of Satan had introduced into it. But in order that it might be so, the master of the garden must be made strong and steadfast, that he might overcome the enemy who would be always plotting to overthrow God’s designs ; therefore he was put into the garden, not merely to dress it, but also to guard it. It must be remarked that we have here a revelation of God in a new character. He is represented as a ruler, who, for good and wise purposes, lays down restrictions, and demands obedience from His subjects, under pain of their forfeiting privileges, and incurring well-deserved penalties for transgression. It is worth notice also, that this man, who, if things had gone right, was to be the ruler of the earth, and the lord of its inhabitants, had to begin with lowly work of the hands as a preparation for higher things. Nor ought we to miss the fact here plainly set forth, that the human race did not commence its career as a horde of savage hunters, or even as a migratory tribe moving about from place to place, but in a peaceful, settled occupation as tillers of the ground.

Probably we need not suppose that there was anything extraordinary as regards the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in itself. It certainly was not intended to convey or to inflict immediate bodily death ; for Adam lived hundreds of years after eating it, and might, if he had been able to gain access to the tree of life, have lived for ever. He was forbidden to eat of it, as a test of his faith and obedience ; and the death which he would incur by transgression was the destruction of his human prerogative of free-will, caused not by any natural effect of the fruit, but by the withdrawal of God's grace, which was a necessary complement of his humanity.

V. 18. *And (Jehovah) God said, It is not good that the man should be alone ; I will make him an help meet for him.*

We may suppose that in his previous condition the man had plenty of society, living with the holy angels, and from time to time having converse with God Himself. But in his new abode, though there might be certain angels set as guardians to watch over him, and visits from other denizens of the heavenly places, and even, as we shall see, sometimes from God Himself, there would no longer be the constant and familiar intercourse with the heavenly host to which he had been accustomed. Moreover, having now come to the age of maturity, he would begin to feel longings for a companionship which neither angels, nor even, be it said with reverence, God Himself, could supply. But before meeting his need, God wished him distinctly to feel it, and to perceive that none of the animals already existing, however pleasant their companionship might be to him, could fully satisfy it.

V. 19. *And of the earth (Jehovah) God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air.*

Here again we must notice, as in the case of the trees, that it is not the whole animal kingdom that is spoken of, but every beast of the *field*, and every fowl of the *air*, that is to say, it was those animals with

which man is associated. They are further particularised in the twentieth verse as *all cattle*, and the *fowl of the air*, and *every beast of the field*. We must not suppose that these animals were formed at this moment. Exactly the same word—*yitzer*—is used of their derivation from the ground, that is employed in the case of man; and we have fully explained what it meant in that instance. These animals were not *created* now, but they were the final developments of a long line, which started from the original animal germ. We must understand that that final development had made its appearance some time before this, and that out of the races so produced God selected, it may be at this point, certain choice individuals, and placed them in the garden of Eden, to be man's associates. These animals then,

(Jehovah) God brought unto the man to see what he would call them : and whatsoever the man called every living soul, that was the name thereof.

It is very noticeable here how the Lord is represented as drawing out both the perceptive faculties and the free-will of Adam. Man is not told what he is to call the animals; but God, as it were, stands aside, with some degree of curiosity, if we may say so with reverence, to see what, using his own observation, man would of his own accord choose to name them. Besides this purpose, we may well believe that the animals were brought to Adam to do him homage, as it were, and to recognise him as their lord; and it is implied that they were all peaceable, and capable of associating with each other without violence or bloodshed, though entirely free to rove about and live each in its own haunt.

V. 20. *And the man gave names to all cattle and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field ;*

This is the first occasion on which we find the faculty of speech attributed to man. We will not here consider what the language may have been which he spoke, but it is obvious, if there is any truth in the

foregoing account of the way in which he was brought up, that it must have been the speech which he learnt in the heavenly places. If so, human language did not commence in imitative sounds, or interjectional exclamations expressive of excited feelings, or by any other process by which it may be proposed to educe articulate speech from the sounds uttered by animals. The man must have started with a systematically constructed tongue, amply sufficient for his immediate use, and capable of being modified to meet any enlargement of his ideas or necessities.

but for man there was not found an help meet for him.

The word *meet* hardly expresses the force of the original Hebrew, which means sufficiently like himself to afford him true companionship and assistance without being exactly his counterpart. We may suppose that the process of reviewing and naming the creatures would occupy some considerable period; and by the time it was completed, the man himself had become convinced that however amusing and interesting these animals might be, there was not one of them that he could make his constant companion, and intimate and confidential friend. Therefore,

V. 21. (*Jehovah*) *God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof:*

V. 22. *and the rib which (Jehovah) God had taken from the man made He a woman, and brought her unto the man.*

Here we have an operation of divine surgery, and not a creation, any more than when at its birth a child is separated from its mother. It is a remote analogy, but that operation was something like taking a slip from a plant and setting it to become a fresh individual of the species. Probably certain special cells of the human body would be capable, under proper treatment, of producing the entire human being. Such treatment cannot be applied by us in our present state of knowledge, but it would not be beyond the scope of

Divine power.* We must of course believe that the female element was contained in Adam ; and probably we may infer that whatever purely distinctive feminine element there may be, exists in some form and in some degree, though not ordinarily apparent, in man. We may be sure that He Who, when He made a gift of wine, supplied it in abundant measure and of the finest quality, did not stint His hand in the magnificent present which He was now making to the man, but that the woman He formed was endowed with splendid grace and beauty, and with every excellence of mind as well as body, that was suitable to her condition. And so, when the Lord God led the woman to the man, the hearts of these two went out to each other, and the man's longing for a companion was abundantly satisfied. Not the least engaging thing about her at first must have been her utter want of knowledge and experience, which would lay upon the man the pleasant task of guiding, guarding, and informing her continually. Probably she did not know even how to talk, for she makes no response to the words which were called forth from the man by her coming. But she would very soon learn his language, for to her it would be the expression of love and endearment. Probably, though his sleep was of such a nature as to save him from all pain, it did not prevent the man from having some sense, as in a trance, of what was going on ; for when he was aroused, and the woman was brought to his awakened sight, the man said :

V. 23. *This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh : she shall be called Woman, because she is taken out of Man.*

The word for man here used is totally different from that which has been employed hitherto. Instead of *Adam* we have *Ish*, which denotes man in his higher relations, and among them his relation to woman, so

* See Appendix D, p. 138.



that it is now rightly used for the first time. The word for woman is *Ishshah*, which is simply the feminine form of *Ish*.

V. 24. *Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife : and they twain shall be one flesh.*

We see from this that Adam had been previously instructed about the relationships of father, mother, and child, and he declares under Divine inspiration, that the connection of husband and wife was to be closer than any other ; so close as to supersede, or at any rate loosen, every other tie, and to involve a union which would be only dissoluble by a process of separation that resembled tearing flesh from flesh.

V. 25. *And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.*

We must remember that the human body had not, as yet, been weakened by disease or debauchery, nor enfeebled either by privation or luxury. We may too assume that there was then a beauty and a serenity of climate, which would not expose the body to any great or sudden extremes of temperature. Indeed, at the present moment the winter is exceedingly mild in the land which we have supposed to correspond with Eden. But far more beautiful was the brightness and serenity which reigned within. As man was first created, his free-will had complete control over all his longings, affections, passions ; so that they would not be aroused except at proper times and on proper occasions, when it was the will of God that they should be gratified. Therefore, the man and his wife were naked and were not ashamed, for indeed, they had nothing to be ashamed of.

It has long been a commonplace of those Biblical critics who do not recognise the Book of Genesis as an authentic record, that the first and second chapters contain two accounts of the creation, which are not merely independent, but in some respects contradictory to each other. And the "higher" critics discover

differences in the order of creation, differences in the expressions used to describe it, and differences in the terms employed to portray the actions of God. To all this, the foregoing interpretation, if there is any truth in it, is a sufficient answer. There is no creation described in the second chapter, but a very different process, namely, the coming forth of the final result of a long chain of evolution. And because the process is a totally different one, the words used to express it are necessarily different : nor is it obvious that in this final process of coming forth into visible existence, exactly the same order must have been followed as in the original creation. The very difference of the terms used in describing the actions of God in the second chapter, would suggest that what He is represented as doing is not the same as in the first. The real question is, whether those terms accurately describe what He did, and whether the expressions used in the first chapter would have done so. Whether an account of the actual formation of Adam and Eve, and of the highest orders of plants and animals, written about the year 750 B.C., when Jotham was king of Judah, which is the date ascribed by the new critics to the greater part of the second chapter of Genesis, would have been likely to fall in equally well with the facts of the case, as above set forth, the reader can judge for himself.

CHAPTER III.

THE RECORD OF THE FALL.

We have seen the human race started on its course by the formation of its first parents ; and we cannot but feel some interest in tracing its intended progress if all had gone on well. The Paradise in which Adam and Eve were placed was spacious enough to afford room for their children to dwell together for many generations. Every part of it would by degrees become more perfectly cultivated, as the time went on and the number of tillers of the soil was increased. It is not probable that if mankind had continued innocent, living according to the will of God, they would have escaped all sorrow and pain. Man was not created perfect, but was intended to advance by degrees to maturity in mind and in spirit, and it seems to be a law of progress towards higher things in the case of all sentient beings, that they shall be made “ perfect through sufferings.” We have seen that there was an Adversary of God and man ever watching to inflict disappointment, loss, and anguish, upon both. We may think it probable that God for good and wise purposes would permit him to be more or less successful. What the nature of the sufferings would have been, which had thus to be endured by God’s unfallen creatures, we can hardly venture to surmise ; but assuredly one chief ingredient in them must have been the painful struggle of overcoming severe temptation. Had Adam stood firm, his descendants would have been strengthened for that struggle, and each time that it was waged successfully, the race would have become more capable of enduring ; till at last the danger of failure might have been nearly removed. Thus as mankind multiplied, they would have become numerous and strong enough to go forth from the Paradise in which they had been nurtured,—taking with them the

selected races of plants and animals, which had grown up with them,—to dominate by degrees the rest of the earth, and expel from it all the evil and noxious productions which the malice of Satan had developed. Gradually mankind would have spread over the whole earth, and in doing so would probably have become separated into different tribes, races, and nations, taking possession of different countries peaceably and without a struggle. These nations would have kept up friendly and beneficial intercourse with one another, and as far as man was concerned the whole earth would have been at rest. But the contest with the unseen powers of darkness would have probably waxed fiercer and fiercer as time went on. Satan would not have given up his hold upon this earth without a tremendous struggle. In that struggle the human race might have suffered most severely, and oftentimes been sorely pressed. But at last the crisis would have arrived,—the Son of God would have come to the rescue of His brethren, and after enduring all that the Enemy of God was permitted to inflict upon Him, would have come forth victorious from the conflict, and the race of man would have been finally delivered from the power of the Evil One.

We have now to see how this divine purpose was not defeated, but delayed, complicated, and hampered, by the failure of man to perform his part in carrying it out.

V. 1. *Now the serpent was more sagacious than any beast of the field which (Jehovah) God had made.*

The word “subtil,” which is used by the translators of our Bible, is misleading, as almost always implying something evil. But the Hebrew word “‘arum” does not necessarily express anything sinister; it is used in the Book of Proverbs to denote the “prudent” man as opposed to the fool: e.g., *The wisdom of the prudent is to understand his way, but the folly of fools is deceit.* (Proverbs xiv. 3). Hence there is here no suggestion of malice on the part of the serpent.

Probably after the beasts had been once brought to Adam, and received their names from him, they associated familiarly with him and Eve, so that they had opportunities of observing their several habits and peculiarities. Thus they were led to notice the cleverness of the serpent, and the skill with which he did anything which he wished to effect. Satan also was well aware of this characteristic, and plotted to make use of it in carrying out his malicious design for the ruin of the head of God's earthly creation. Probably he determined to make his attempt as soon as possible after the formation of Eve, while she was yet inexperienced, and had everything to learn. He knew that Adam had been told to beware of him, and that from the knowledge gained in the heavenly places where he had been brought up, he had learned to trust both the wisdom and the goodness of God, and would not easily be turned against Him. He had discerned also how much the man admired and loved his wife, and how glad he was to do anything that would please her ; so he plotted to lead astray the woman through her inexperience, curiosity, and desire to learn, and the man by means of his affection for her. No doubt Adam had warned her of God's prohibition respecting the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and had told her not to go near the spot where it was planted. Knowing her want of experience, he would be unwilling to lose sight of her for any length of time, lest some evil should befall her. Most likely the poison had begun to work before the actual transgression took place. Eve had allowed her mind to dwell upon the forbidden tree, wondering what it was like, why she was prohibited from eating of its fruit, and what it would be to know good and evil. More and more the idea gained possession of her, and at last, impelled by a fatal curiosity, she thought she would merely go and look at the tree, and slipped away to do so without the knowledge of Adam. The tree was easy to find, for it was conspicuous in the midst of the garden, with

no other tree near it, save that of life. Eve was too full of joyous life in every vein to feel any need of the latter tree, but she was conscious of her want of knowledge, and intensely eager to remedy it. Here was the opportunity which the Adversary had longed for, and had plotted to obtain. With that power to take possession of the bodies and dominate the wills of living creatures which he has often displayed since then, he impelled the serpent to glide up the tree, and do his evil bidding. The woman welcomed him as an acquaintance whose clever and amusing gambols she had often observed; and when he began to address her, her inexperience of what was likely or unlikely to happen, prevented her from being startled.

And he said unto the woman, is it so, that God hath said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

Eve was looking at the tree, probably with longing eyes, and he takes it for granted that she would like to eat of it unless she were forbidden.

V. 2-3. *And the woman said unto the serpent, Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.*

It is observable that the reviser who, since the fourth verse of the second chapter, has persistently inserted the name "Jehovah" before the word "God" wherever it occurs, does not do so in this dialogue between the serpent and the woman, but leaves the word "God" to stand alone. Probably he felt that the sacred name would be profaned if represented as being uttered by the Evil One, and therefore omitted it altogether from this conversation.

V. 4-5. *And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil.*

Here, as ever in his temptations, the Enemy mixes truth and falsehood. It was true that their eyes would

be opened, and they would know good and evil ; but it was a falsehood that they would not die, or that they would know good and evil as God knew it. And now the mistrust of God, to which the woman had been laying herself open by letting her mind dwell on that which He had forbidden, began to work within her. What if God had refused to allow her husband and herself to partake of the tree because He did not wish them to share a privilege which would make them like Himself ? Of her own free choice Eve entertained the deadly thought, and like everyone who yields to temptation, she was ruined by her want of faith in Him Who is All-good and All-wise.

V. 6. *And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food,—*

Probably because the fruit was like other fruits of which she often partook ; and perhaps because she saw the birds pecking at it, and getting no harm.

and that it was a delight to the eyes,—

Here comes in woman's special love for that which is beautiful ;

and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise,—

For had not God, as well as the serpent, said that this would be the effect of eating it ?

she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat.

Thus the mischief was consummated, and the woman seemed to have gained that for which she longed. And now comes out one most striking fact in this sad history. The knowledge which she sought, Eve would surely have acquired more truly by resisting the temptation than by yielding to it ; for God, and holy angels who have never sinned, know what good and evil are, far more perfectly than beings who have fallen. Sin, when it is first yielded to, throws a glamour over the eyes of the understanding, and when persisted in, produces permanent blindness. On the other hand, temptation resisted is a stepping-stone to the discernment of the evil as it really is, and to the appreciation of the loveliness of that which is good.

With that uneasy excitement and elation which attends the breaking through of a restriction, Eve hastened away to tell the news to her husband. One can imagine with what a look of consternation and cry of alarm he received it. He could see at once the terrible nature of what she had done so lightly, and at first his perplexity would make him at a loss what to say or do. Then began a struggle which has often been repeated since, but never with such momentous consequences at stake. Eve would use all her loveliness, all her blandishments, and when these failed, her entreaties and tears, to induce him to partake of the fruit which she had brought in her hand. If she had fallen into trouble would he now desert her and leave her to bear her doom, whatever it might be, alone ? To such persuasions, Adam, alas ! finally yielded.

She gave also unto her husband with her ; and he did eat.

Oh ! if men would only believe in such cases that the good of the woman they love, no less than their own, depends upon their standing firm, they would gain strength to resist. Eve's fall might have been remedied ; her inexperience, her little knowledge of God, her imperfect realisation of His wondrous wisdom and goodness, and lastly, an inability, which seems peculiar to her sex, to realize the consequences of what she was doing, would all tend to excuse her, and lighten the guilt of her transgression. If her husband had stood firm, he might have had the joy of leading her back by degrees, and in the end, of restoring her to her first estate. But his sin was a far more fatal one than hers ; he had been carefully trained in the heavenly places to know the attributes of God, His infinite power, wisdom, and goodness. Of that goodness he had had a long experience, as one blessing after another had been heaped upon him with an ungrudging hand. As S. Paul says, *Adam was not deceived*, (I. Timothy ii. 14)—he sinned with his eyes open, knowing the tremendous consequences. In

his love to his wife he forgot his supreme duty and paramount obligation to the love of God. *He worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever.* It was the most momentous act of idolatry that ever was committed; and those who speak lightly of it as only the eating of an apple or attempt to explain it away as a mythical or figurative representation, only show that they have failed to realize the tremendous import of the facts taken as an authentic record. What was the immediate effect produced on the nature of Adam and Eve? They at once lost that dominion and control which the human will was intended to exercise over all the longings, emotions, and desires, of the entire being. This was the death of the spirit of which they had been forewarned, and which followed close upon their transgression. Probably the change was effected by the withdrawal of divine grace, which was intended to have been an abiding possession, a permanent ingredient of man's nature. Soon they were carried away by unwonted emotions, and that which had been hitherto pure, holy, according to the will of God, delightful in giving mutual delight, became an imperious lust of the flesh, *not subject to the law of God*, a matter of selfish gratification. At length, wearied, satiated, and disgusted, they found it necessary to protect themselves from themselves and each other.

V. 7. *And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.*

For some time God left all the parties implicated in this great act of rebellion to themselves. At first, the exultation of the Evil One at the immense victory he had gained would be unbounded. Apparently he had succeeded in ruining altogether the design which it had taken ages to bring to a completion. But when the first excitement of success had passed away, there would follow an uneasy consciousness that God would not allow Himself to be permanently defeated, and

that his daring attempt would call down some dreadful doom upon himself. So too, when Adam and his wife had recovered from their excitement, a misgiving as to what had befallen them already, and what might yet come upon them, must have depressed their spirits. After a long suspense, a well-known sound was borne to them on the evening breeze.

V. 8. *And they heard the voice of (Jehovah) God walking in the garden in the cool of the day ;*

Probably God appeared in a visible form. This may be inferred from the expression “ walking,” and still more from the dread which they felt lest He should behold their nudity. What should they do ? They dared not face Him with the consciousness of the change that had come over them ;

and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of (Jehovah) God amongst the trees of the garden.

They must have known that it was in vain.

V. 9. *And (Jehovah) God called unto the man, and said unto him, Where art thou ?*

At the sound of that awful voice they were constrained to come forth and stand before their Judge. Then Adam began to make excuse for his unreadiness to meet his Benefactor :

V. 10. *And he said, I heard Thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked ; and I hid myself.*

V. 11. *And He said, Who told thee that thou wast naked ? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat ?*

Adam made what defence he could ; it was literally true, and yet one which he should have been ashamed to urge.

V. 12. *And the man said, The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.*

The woman had been given to him to teach, protect, and guide, with a loving authority ; and he had not done his duty to her, any more than to God Himself,

when he permitted her to lead him astray. However, this confession showed the course which the transgression had taken ; God next interrogated Eve.

V. 13. *And (Jehovah) God said unto the woman, What is this thou hast done ? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.*

No doubt the serpent had been drawn to attend this dread assize, and we may be sure that the Evil One, who had made use of him, was present, though unseen.

V. 14. *And (Jehovah) God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle, and above every beast of the field ; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.*

Neither the serpent nor his master are asked any question or invited to make any defence ; the former could only be puzzled and affrighted by the whole proceeding ; the latter had no excuse to offer. It must be observed that although the sentence is ostensibly pronounced upon the serpent, yet apparently it could have had little or no effect in altering his condition, while every word of it applied with fearful force to Satan. *Cursed art thou.*—“ My wrath shall sink thee lower than the unintelligent flocks and herds, and thou shalt become baser than the meanest brute ; thou shalt pursue thy course through filth and degradation, and everything with which thou shalt seek to gratify thy cravings shall turn to dryness, disappointment and defeat.”

So far the sentence is easy to be explained, but now comes the wondrous part of the prediction.

V. 15. *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed : it shall crush thy head, and thou shalt crush his heel.*

We shall understand this prophecy best if we consider how it must have sounded in the ears of Adam. He had probably learnt already that he and his descendants would have to carry on an age-long struggle

with the power of evil; that in that struggle they might have to endure many hardships and sufferings, but at last through the intervention of a mighty Succourer, they would be completely victorious. The general import, therefore, of that which was foretold, he must have understood more or less perfectly. But what must have appeared most wonderful to him in this prediction was, that he himself, who was to have been God's chief champion in the fight with the Evil One, had through his transgression lost that grand position. It is not *I will put enmity between thee and the "man,"* but *between thee and the "woman."* She had proved herself stronger than her husband in the power of influence; and though her use of this power had in the present instance been a mischievous one, yet it was a divine gift, and might be employed for noblest purposes. By virtue of this power she was to be henceforth the chief antagonist of the Evil One.—*I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed.*—It was chiefly as the seed of the woman, nurtured by her in godliness, in purity, in truth, and love, that men would go forth into the world strong to combat the Evil One. As mother, sister, wife, her influence for good would constantly foil the tempter, and strengthen men in all virtuous and godly living. And at last there would come a woman to whom it would be given to bring forth and bring up One, pre-eminently the seed of the woman, Who would lead His brethren on to final victory. With such a destiny as this marked out for her, how terrible it seems that any woman should be a mere trifler or worse, wasting her life, or laying it waste! One expression still remains to be considered: what is meant by *thy seed*? Fallen angels appear never to be called in Holy Scripture the seed of Satan; evil men, alas! are often represented as becoming his children. There can be little doubt that by the seed of the serpent are here denoted all who are knowingly and persistently fighting on the side of

evil. They become more and more like Satan, his servants and his children, dominated at last completely by his awful wickedness. These, under his influence, would be for ever fighting against, molesting, and trying to seduce, the true seed of the woman. This is the battle ever going on between light and darkness, truth and falsehood, love and malice, and blessed is he who never consciously, even for a moment, joins the ranks of evil.

It shall crush thy head, and thou shalt crush his heel. By the head of the serpent we may understand the higher, intellectual part of Satan's nature. So taken, the prophecy implies that after his last great act of rebellion and final defeat (Rev. xx. 7-10), those splendid intellectual powers which have enabled him even to fight against God, and to plan and perpetrate such grand and magnificent wickednesses, shall be taken from him: he shall be himself *the worm that dieth not*, and little better than a worm. On the other hand, *his heel*, which Satan is permitted to crush, denotes the lower and earthly part of man's nature, that "flesh" which Christ stripped Himself of in His death and passion, and from which all His true followers will finally be delivered. It is through Satan's instrumentality in inflicting suffering and death, that this lower nature of man is destroyed.

But the woman would only attain and hold her high position by virtue of special suffering.

V. 16. *Unto the woman He said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.*

By *thy sorrow* is meant all the sufferings which are peculiar to the sex, more especially those connected with child-bearing. Apparently,—as one consequence of the Fall, the multiplication of the human race was to go on far more rapidly than had been at first intended; and birth, which would have been an easy, natural process, became difficult and dangerous. *Thy*

desire shall be to thy husband.—It seems to be a law of woman's nature that her longing affection for her husband shall be stronger, more constant, and more absorbing than that of the husband for the wife ; and this very fact, together with her comparative weakness, dependence, and need of protection, gives him a power which he is rightfully intended to have, but which may be terribly abused.

For the man also a stern discipline was needed—

V. 17. *And unto Adam He said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it : cursed is the ground for thy sake, in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life ;*

The essence of Adam's offence was that he had hearkened unto the voice of his wife, instead of attending to the command of God. Therefore the ground, which had hitherto yielded its produce easily, and with no more labour than was a pleasant exercise to him who tilled it, should henceforth become changed for the worse for man's sake ; not only for his punishment, but also for his correction, and the strengthening of his character. Toilsome labour should teach him endurance, and call forth his energies in overcoming the infelicities of the soil.

V. 18. *thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee : and thou shalt eat the herb of the field ;*

V. 19. *in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.*

No doubt outside of Paradise, Satan, in his malicious marring of the natural development of the vegetable world, had already produced thorns and thistles, and other useless and noxious herbs. In the Garden, man had not encountered these ; but now, expelled from his favoured abode, he would have to cope with and keep under all these deleterious productions, and that could not be done except by continuous and anxious labour, which should only end with his life ;—*in toil shalt thou eat :*

till thou return unto the ground ; for out of it wast

thou taken : for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

This is apparently the first intimation of the death of the body. We have seen already in what sense man may be said to be *dust* ; anyone who has had to do with bodies which have been long interred, knows how truly they return to dust. Even the carefully preserved Egyptian mummies are ready to crumble away at a touch, on exposure to the air.

Two remarks may be made with regard to the sentences pronounced on the Evil One and his dupes. In the first place the cursing of the ground shows that by anything being laid under the curse of God, it is not necessarily implied that that which is accursed has drawn down the curse by its own guilt, or even that it is conscious of the deterioration which has befallen it. All that it implies is that God, for good and wise purposes, has put that which He has cursed in a worse position in some respects than it was before. Thus if the serpent was affected at all by the sentence ostensibly pronounced upon him, it is not as having been consciously to blame for what had occurred.

Secondly, it may be observed that Satan himself apparently was made the instrument of carrying out the penalties which were inflicted. As regards himself, it would be his own persistent malice and obstinate resistance of God that would drag him down in ever-increasing degradation and disappointment. And since he is spoken of as having the *power of death* (Hebrews ii. 16), we may believe that it is he who has been permitted to produce those changes in the human body, and to develop those germs of disease, which are the cause of suffering and death alike in man and woman. He too, in all probability, was given the power to change the nature of the soil, and to multiply almost indefinitely the noxious herbage which he had already produced. Thus, in every way this rebellious spirit was made, in spite of his rebellion,

yea, even because of it, to subserve the purposes of God's punishment, and so ultimately of His mercy.

V. 20. *And the man called his wife's name Eve ; because she was the mother of all living.*

The word *Eve* (Hebrew, " Chavvah ") means " life." By this time Adam had become aware that all human life was to flow from the woman as from a fountain-head ; therefore, he gave her this name. Hence, it is hardly possible for those who believe that Genesis is an authentic record to suppose that the human race derived its origin from several different centres.

V. 21. *And to Adam also and to his wife did (Jehovah) God make coats of skins and clothed them.*

It has been asked whence these skins were procured. We must remember that though hitherto there had probably been no death, even among the animals, in Paradise, yet the destruction of brute life had long been going on outside the favoured enclosure ; and therefore, such slaughter of animals as was necessary to supply materials for clothing, would present no difficulty. This act of providing garments for the covering of Adam and Eve, besides its obvious purpose, had a spiritual significance. It denoted that, to use the expression of the Psalmist, their *sin was covered*, their *transgression was forgiven*. And since forgiveness seems always to imply a gift of grace to enable a sinner to do better, there was probably at this time a partial restitution of that which man had lost,—some restoration of the influences of God's Good Spirit ; not indeed, as an abiding Presence, an essential complement of man's nature, but external and occasional ; sufficient, with the co-operation of his own free-will, to restrain him from inordinate passion.

V. 22. *And (Jehovah) God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil ;*

To whom are these words addressed ? Since the holy angels share with God the knowledge of good and evil, we may suppose that these words were spoken to some of them.

and now lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever :

V. 23. *therefore (Jehovah) God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.*

There was the danger that when man began to feel the failure of power, or the actual incursion of sickness and disease, he might seek that renewal of health and activity which the tree of life had the property of conveying, and so prolong his bodily existence contrary to the intention of Almighty God. Therefore, access to the healing tree was taken away from him. Clearly then the vital power contained in this sacramental tree was independent of the moral condition of him who sought its help.

This is the last time that the name Jehovah has been inserted before the word " God " (Yahveh Elohim).* Perhaps from the fourth chapter a different reviser took up the work ; or more probably the same person felt that he had made it sufficiently evident that Jehovah and Elohim were identical, and therefore allowed Elohim henceforth to stand without any addition.

V. 24. *So He drove out the man :*

This expression implies the unwillingness of Adam to leave the garden where he had been so happy. Probably Adam and Eve lingered, as Lot and his family did in Sodom, till holy angels applied some sort of compulsion to oblige them to hurry forth.

and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword turning itself about, to guard the way to the tree of life.

* The Septuagint, however, continues to give from time to time, the phrase " Lord God," *i.e.*, Jehovah God ; which shows that " Yahveh Elohim " was found in some Hebrew manuscripts at the time when that version was made. Since, however, the present Hebrew text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Vulgate, agree from this point in not inserting Jehovah before the word God, we may conclude that such was the more approved reading.

It will be observed that no description is given of the Cherubim, or of the flaming sword : they are spoken of as well-known, *the Cherubim* and *the . . . sword*. What is the reason of this ? The obvious explanation is, that they were still there at the time when this narrative was composed, so that everyone knew what they were. Apparently, this is the only place in Holy Scripture where the Cherubim are represented as appearing to the waking eye, and not in a vision. The four living creatures described by Ezekiel (Ezekiel i. 5-26), who are called Cherubim, and are further described (x. 1-22), have clearly a symbolical form intended to set forth their attributes : and the same may be said of the four living creatures,—if they are to be regarded as the Cherubim,—seen by S. John in the visions of the Apocalypse (Revelation iv. 7-8). All that we can say about them is, that everywhere they appear as the immediate attendants on the throne of God. Thus the images of them in the tabernacle and afterwards in the temple, are represented as shadowing the Mercy-seat, which held the unseen Presence of the Almighty. We may assume then that the appearance of these Cherubim, set on the east side of the garden, implied that God was present there, in some especial sense, though invisible. Thus there was from the first a place appointed by God Himself, where men might draw near to Him in worship and supplication.

It is not easy to tell from the Hebrew, whether *the flame of a sword* was a flame in the shape of a sword, or rather a sword of burnished metal, which, in its rapid brandishing backwards and forwards, flashed in the sunshine like a flame of fire. The fact that the tree of life was not taken away, but only guarded from evil access, held out the hope that man might some day be allowed to recover the use of its healing virtues. Thus Adam and Eve, though driven out, were not cast off nor deserted by their Maker. They might still hold communion with Him ; some grace was given for the support of their souls ; and the hope was held forth to

them of the restoration of their bodily life, and of the final triumph, through a Redeemer, over the malice of the Evil One. Satan, as he saw all this, must have felt that whatever mischief he had wrought, and woe he had occasioned, he had yet failed in his main object,—the utter ruin of man.

It only remains to say something about the authorship of the second and third chapters of Genesis. It seems clear from the term “(Jehovah) God” being used constantly from the fourth verse of the second chapter to the end of the third chapter, and being given up in the narrative that follows, that the former passage of Scripture originally formed one document, detached from what went before and what followed after. Who was the author of this document? There were only two persons who, from their own knowledge, could relate the occurrences described in it. Clearly, if this is an authentic record, it must have been originally narrated by Adam himself. We may well believe that, considering the momentous import of the facts related, Adam was instigated and inspired to draw up a formal account of these events, for the instruction of those who should come after him. We need not suppose that this account was at once committed to writing. It was not too long to be learnt by heart, and to be handed down for some time in an unvarying tradition.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RECORD OF THE FIRST BIRTHS AND THE FIRST DEATHS IN THE HUMAN FAMILY.

The human race had made a bad beginning ; but we must not suppose that the life in Paradise had been wasted, or its experiences thrown away. No doubt, Adam was permitted to carry forth with him all the cattle and domestic animals, as well as the vegetable productions, which would be of use to him in his altered condition. The country in which Paradise was situated was, as we have seen, called Eden, probably from its beautiful climate, which would only become deteriorated by degrees. Only gradually too would the adverse influences of the soil be multiplied. So we may suppose that the life of Adam and Eve, though saddened and rendered more toilsome, was not excessively arduous. And soon a new interest was given to cheer them.

V. 1. *And the man knew Eve his wife and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gained a man with God.**

The formation of Eve herself had been peculiar and abnormal. Probably therefore, the expressions which are used here in describing the generation of Cain, and again in verse 17, in relating the birth of Cain's first child, and lastly in verse 25, in describing the birth of Seth, are intended to indicate that the propagation of the human race had now become regular, and that there was no longer any anomaly in it. The word "Cain" signifies "an acquisition"; so here Eve strikes the

* This is the reading of both the Septuagint and the Vulgate ; showing that the Hebrew manuscripts which the authors of those versions had before them, gave "Elohim," not "Yahveh"; and as it is certain that Eve could not have used the name Jehovah, we have not hesitated, upon the authority of those versions, to adopt the other reading.

true note of a mother's joy, that has gone on echoing through the ages. Whatever be the circumstances of privation, degradation, or guilt, in which a child is brought forth, the mother feels, or has at any rate a right to feel, that she has gained a great acquisition, and that she has co-operated with God in gaining it. This thought may give hope and confidence to the most sinful and most wretched mother, conveying the assurance that God has not deserted her, and will help her to better things if she will but trust in Him.

V. 2. *And again she bare his brother Abel.*

Though the two births are mentioned close together, probably there was an interval of some years between them, during which it is very likely that a daughter who is not named, may have been born. After the sad experience which they had had, and the solemn prophecy which had been given of a woman's work, we cannot doubt but that Cain was most carefully brought up by Eve to know God and keep His commandments. Yet probably, even before Abel was born, Cain had shown such a disposition as to mar his parents' joy, and change their hopes into misgivings. If this were the case, we can understand how Eve gave birth to a second son with sadder anticipations. She named him "Havel" (Abel), that is "Vanity."

And Abel became a keeper of flocks, but Cain became a tiller of the ground.*

As we have said, Adam, on his expulsion from Paradise, was no doubt permitted to take with him such animals as would be of use to him, including the sheep and goats of which Abel, as he grew up, had the charge; and likewise the cereals and other serviceable productions of the earth, of which the cultivation was intrusted to Cain.

V. 3. *And in process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering unto (Jehovah).*

* The Hebrew word here used, "tzohn," denotes goats as well as sheep.

It has often been supposed that Cain did wrong in offering the fruit of the ground rather than an animal ; but it was natural and right that he should present that which was peculiarly his, and we know that under the Mosaic law, the sacrifice of the productions of the earth was especially commanded as choice and acceptable. Notice that the word (Jehovah) is here for the first time employed alone. This implies that the reviser who inserted it had a document before him in which he found no longer *Elohim* (God), but some other designation of the Divine Being. Can we now tell what that new designation was ? Almost certainly we can. In the sixth chapter of Exodus, verse three, God says to Moses, *I am Jehovah : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (El Shaddai), but by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them.* Now the word “ El ” means “ a mighty one,” and the epithet “ Shaddai,” denoting “ most powerful,” “ almighty,” merely intensifies this sense : so that the name is “ El,” used sometimes with, but more often without, the intensifying epithet. El, then, is the word which the reviser has replaced by Jehovah, Jehovah having declared that it was the name by which He originally revealed Himself. Generally the substitution of Jehovah for El was a perfectly harmless and natural one, but as we shall see presently, there are some instances in which the sense considerably loses by it.

V. 4. *And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof.*

We need not suppose that this was the first time that they had worshipped the Deity : as we have seen, a place of worship had been appointed from the first, and we may conclude that it had constantly been used by Adam and his family. But on this occasion the sacrifice was made ever memorable by the events which resulted from it. Probably Cain had committed some special act, or fallen into some habit, of sin, and had come into the presence of God

without shame and without repentance. We know not what was the sign which betokened God's acceptance of a sacrifice, but whatever it may have been, this time it was withheld from Cain's offering, while it was granted to Abel's.

V. 4-5. *And (Jehovah) had respect unto Abel and to his offering ; but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect.*

And now Cain's evil disposition was manifested violently.*

And Cain was very wroth and his countenance fell.

Instead of inquiring humbly why God was displeased with him, he dared to be angry with God. But when he had gone away, and his exasperation had subsided, the Lord in His pity, deigned to remonstrate with him and to point out the unreasonableness of his conduct.

V. 6-7. *And (Jehovah) said unto Cain, why art thou wroth ? and why is thy countenance fallen ? Is there not, if thou wilt do well, lifting up ?*

That is, " If thou wilt abandon that which has displeased Me, and do what is right, is there not restoration to My favour ? "

but if thou wilt not do well, at the door is sin, a liar-in-wait :

That is, " If thou wilt persist in thy evil course, thy sin will be as an enemy close at hand, ready at any moment to spring out upon thee, and do thee some grievous mischief." Thus Cain was warned beforehand of that which only too soon befell him. The divine message went on,

and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

* The scientific question, whether acquired characteristics are transmittable by hereditary descent seems to be settled for all who believe the Book of Genesis to be an Authentic Record. We here see that the miserable deterioration introduced into their own nature by the sin of Adam and Eve, was transmitted to Cain, and in a degree which ever tended to increase, to all their descendants.

These words have often been connected immediately with what went before, to denote that sin was seeking to gain Cain, but that he ought to master it. But they are exactly similar to those spoken to Eve: *Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.* (Genesis iii. 16.) There can be little doubt, therefore, that they are intended to express the position of the elder brother with regard to the younger; as much as to say, “My displeasure does not cause thee to lose thy natural right as the elder son; thy brother will continue to look up to thee, and be under thy control.” Anyone who has occupied the position of a younger son, will recognise how exactly the words, *Unto thee shall be his desire, and he shall rule over thee*, express his feeling of deference with regard to an elder brother.

V. 8. *And Cain told Abel his brother.*

The Samaritan and the Septuagint versions give the text as, “And Cain said unto Abel his brother, Let us go into the field”; and the Vulgate as, “Let us go out of doors.” These additions appear to have been made in order to get over a difficulty. The Hebrew word “amar,” “he said,” is always followed by the words spoken, but in this passage, if we adopt the reading of the Hebrew manuscript, no words follow. Hence the Versions thought it necessary to supply something. But probably that which is to be supplied, though not expressed, is simply *it*; “And Cain said (it),” viz.: that which God had spoken in verse 7; so that the Revised Version, *Cain told Abel his brother*, exactly expresses the sense. We can easily understand that Cain would be very careful to let Abel know of the latter part of the divine communication, *Unto thee shall be his desire and thou shalt rule over him.*

And it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.

Whether Cain on some pretext had enticed his brother to a remote place, and there murdered him,

we cannot tell ; but one would rather suppose that they had got into an angry discussion, and that Cain, whom the story shows to have been a man of violent temper, struck his brother down in a sudden outbreak of passion. Probably he was very soon amazed and affrighted at that which he had done, and when he had calmed down sufficiently to listen to a divine message,

V. 9. (*Jehovah*) *said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother ?*

We may infer from this, either that Cain had buried or concealed the body of the murdered man, or that he had fled from the spot where the crime was committed.

And he said, I know not, am I my brother's keeper ?

Not yet had he learned that the eye of God was upon him, wherever he was, and whatever he was doing ; and he had forgotten that his right as elder brother conveyed with it the duty of watching over and caring for the younger.

V. 10. *And He said, What hast thou done ? There is a voice of thy brother's blood crying unto Me from the ground.*

Blood, wrongfully shed, calls to heaven for retribution.

V. 11-12. *And now cursed art thou from the ground, which has opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand ; when thou tillest the ground, she shall not henceforth increase unto thee her fruit ;*

Do we not see this sentence still fulfilled in the case of those nations which have no true regard for the sanctity of human life ?

a fugitive and a wanderer shalt thou be in the earth.

The reason why this sentence was passed upon Cain instead of the heavier one of death, may be partly as we have suggested, that his crime was unpremeditated, and partly that as death had never before happened in the case of any member of the human family, he may not have known altogether what would be the effect of his violence. Clearly he could no longer dwell securely

with his father and his mother, and it was absolutely necessary that he should go forth. And now, for the first time, Cain began to show that the divine dealings with him had not been lost upon him.

V. 13. *And Cain said unto (Jehovah), My guilt is too great to be forgiven.*

He has at last been induced to confess his crime, and to express his horror of it.

V. 14. *Behold, Thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the ground ;*

that is, “Thou hast deprived me of the power to cultivate it ;”

and from Thy face shall I be hid ;

There is this great redeeming point in Cain's character that he had all along valued God's favour, and now felt it an awful thing to have to leave the place where, as we have said, His presence could be recognised.

and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer in the earth ;

As he could no longer cultivate the soil to any advantage, he would have to settle in one place after another, as he exhausted the natural fruits of the earth.

and it shall come to pass that whosoever finds me shall slay me.

It is often supposed that there was a complete separation henceforth between Cain and his descendants and the rest of the human family ; but evidently Cain does not contemplate the continuance of such a separation. Sooner or later, as the children of Adam multiplied, he and they would come in contact, and he feared that blood vengeance would be exacted.

V. 15. *And (Jehovah) said unto him, Therefore, whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold.*

His deep remorse was accepted, and he was assured that he should not die.

And Jehovah set a mark for Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.

We are not told what the sign was ; but we may

suppose that it was some personal mark, perhaps a blood-stain on his forehead.

It may be presumed that he first went back to his parents, and told them the dreadful thing which he had done, and the sentence of God upon him. Probably he was married, and his wife sorrowfully prepared herself to accompany him. Nor is it likely that he was sent forth empty-handed. The flocks of Abel had lost their shepherd, and as Cain could no longer till the ground, his father may have given him a portion of these, to afford him at once occupation and support; and no doubt, he was allowed to carry away any portable goods that might be serviceable to him. For the last time he presented himself before God, where the Cherubim were guarding the entrance to Paradise, and then

V. 16. *Cain went out from the presence of (Jehovah), and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.*

If we have been right in the situation we have assigned to Paradise, the country to the east of Eden can only have been what, in later time, was called the land of Havilah. The Hebrew word “Nod” means flight or wandering, and the name was no doubt, given by Adam and his descendants to the country in which Cain settled, on account of his flight thither. This again, shows that all intercourse was not broken off between Cain and the rest of the human family; but they knew where he was, and what he was doing.

V. 17. *And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bare Enoch.*

The Hebrew word “Chanok” (Enoch) means “instructed” or “trained up”: so that we may gladly believe that Cain intended from the first to bring up his son to avoid the faults which had been his own ruin.

And he became the builder of a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son, “Enoch.”

It must have been long after Enoch was born that the colony in the land of Nod grew large enough

to need a city, however small ; probably it was little more than a moderately sized piece of ground, enclosed with a stockade or wall. It seems likely that any of those born in the original settlement of Adam, who felt restless or got into any trouble, would betake themselves to the fugitive's land, and swell the number of Cain's associates and the inhabitants of the city.

V. 18. *And unto Enoch was born Irad :*

We cannot suggest any meaning of the name Irad ; it probably comes from some root in the primitive language, which was lost in later times.*

and Irad begat Mechujael :

Apparently the Hebrew name "Mechujael" means "stricken" or "afflicted," "of El," and two things at once result from this ; first of all that the descendants of Cain were not a godless race ; and secondly that God had already made himself known under the designation El,—"the Mighty One." Both these points are emphasized by the next name ;

and Mechujael begat Methusael :

for Methusael means "man of El," so that the afflicted father, probably smitten with some bodily defect from his birth, yet acknowledged the goodness of God, and wished his eldest son to grow up devout and faithful.

and Methusael begat Lamech.

Lamech is said to mean "a strong youth" ; if so, it may denote that Lamech was a peculiarly fine and vigorous child, and gave promise of being a strong man. However that may be, the short history of this Lamech and his family is full of interest. First of all we read,

V. 19. *And Lamech took unto him two wives, the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah.*

* Possibly it may mean "ruins he spread," or "trod" ; but this seems a senseless name to give a new-born babe.

Probably this was the beginning of polygamy, which ever since has played so important a part in the family life of the East. The Hebrew name Adah means apparently “an ornament.” The word Zillah signifies “shade,” which seems to us a strange name to give to a female child; but anyone who has travelled in the East, and has found how refreshing is the shadow of a rock or tree in the glare of the Eastern sun, will know how significant the name may be of refreshment and repose.

V. 20. *And Adah bare Jabal:*

which means “stream.”

he became the father of such as dwell in tents and with cattle.

The Hebrew word “miquēh,” which is here translated “cattle,” includes both sheep and oxen. As we have seen, mankind possessed these from the first, for Adam gave names to all cattle (Genesis ii. 20), and these animals, he was, no doubt, allowed to take with him when expelled from Paradise. But what is meant here is that Jabal was the first to organise the nomadic life, with all the appliances for carrying it on advantageously. May we not suppose that it was at this time that Cain built his city, and that Jabal and his associates preferred a wandering life to confinement within its walls?

V. 21. *And his brother's name was Jubal—*

“river,” which means pretty much the same as Jabal.

he became the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe.

That is to say, he was the inventor of music, and constructed alike wind and string instruments in their simplest form.

V. 22. *And Zillah she also bare Tubal-Cain,*

which, perhaps, means “offspring of Cain.” If so, there was a deep significance in the names which Lamech gave to his three sons. In his mind, the stream Jabal, and the river Jubal, as well as Tubal,

flowed forth originally from Cain. Evidently the crime of Cain, and the disadvantage under which his descendants laboured in consequence of it, had deeply impressed the imagination of Lamech ; and a certain mournful incident in his own later life, which we shall have to consider presently, would deepen the impression.

Tubal-Cain, we are told, was

the sharpener of every sort of cutter of bronze and iron :

In the English Versions, the Hebrew word “nechs-heth” is translated “brass.” But brass, as we know it, is an alloy of copper and zinc, and zinc appears to have been unknown to the ancients. On the other hand, they were well acquainted with copper and tin, from the mixture of which bronze is formed, which admits of being sharpened to a reasonably fine edge. We may conclude, therefore, that the word “nechsheth” must have meant bronze, as we have translated it. Hitherto, then, we may suppose that, for all instruments used for cutting or piercing, mankind had employed flint edges and points, but that now Tubal-Cain discovered methods of tempering copper and iron, so as to enable him to give them a sharp edge or piercing point. In short, we have here the record of an age of stone passing into an age of bronze. We shall endeavour, by and by, to estimate when this transition took place, and how long the previous period had lasted, but at present we will merely observe that it was probably not until Tubal-Cain had invented all sorts of cutting tools that Cain built his city.

and the sister of Tubal-Cain was Naamah,

That is, “lovely.” It is remarkable that Adah, Zillah, and Zillah’s daughter Naamah, are the only women whose names are mentioned between the time of Eve and that of Sarai, the wife of Abram—an interval of several thousand years ; we seem, therefore, compelled to see a significance in the mention of these three. That of Adah and Zillah is sufficiently accounted for, by their being addressed in the rhythmical appeal of Lamech which follows, but what reason can be

assigned for the mention of Naamah? Apparently there could only be two reasons, either that the author of the narrative was in some way specially interested in her, or, which is more likely, that he wished to complete the enumeration of this gifted family, with whom he was evidently intimate. Unhappily, across their peaceful avocations there fell the shadow of a very sad misadventure. Useful work was not the only thing to which Tubal-Cain's cutting instruments might be applied;

V. 23-24. *And Lamech said unto his wives :
Adah and Zillah, hear my voice ;
Ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech :
For I have slain a man for wounding me,
And a young man for smiting me :
If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold,
Truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold.*

Here we have unmistakably the earliest rhythmical composition which has been preserved to us. The parallelism which appears, and consists in repeating nearly the same thing in different words, has remained in use as the chief instrument of rhythmical expression in the East down to the present day. And besides the parallelism, we have here some attempt at metre, and even rhyme. It will surprise those who have been accustomed to think of rhyme as a device which originated some time after the beginning of the Christian era, to learn that it is an essential element of the most ancient poetry among the Arabs. Perhaps the following rough version may enable the English reader to appreciate better the rhythmical form of the original.

*Adah and Zillah list to me ;
Wives of Lamech, hear my plea ;
One who wounded me I've slain,
Smiting him who smote, again :
If for Cain be vengeance sevenfold,
Then for Lamech seventy-sevenfold.*

Probably no death had as yet occurred among the human race since that of Abel; and significantly

enough, like the one first recorded, this was a death by violence. Apparently it was the excitement of Lamech coming red-handed and bleeding from the deed, and meeting his wives with a look of horror in their faces at his disordered appearance, that called forth spontaneously this metrical defence of himself. What led to the quarrel, and who was the aggressor, we cannot tell, but Lamech pleads that he has committed homicide in self-defence ; and because this is the case, he contrasts his deed favourably with that of his progenitor, and claims that if Cain was protected by a threat of sevenfold vengeance on anyone who slew him, he who seeks to exact blood-vengeance from himself, ought to pay a far heavier penalty.

V. 25. *And Adam knew his wife again : and she bare a son, and called his name Seth,*

i.e., " appointed : "

for, said she, God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, for Cain slew him.

We may infer from this that Abel left no son to carry on the line. And we think that another point comes out in these words of Eve : evidently it was the second son, as is so often the case, round whom the mother's heart has been specially entwined, for she does not think of Seth as a substitute for Cain, but as one who had been given her to fill the void made by the loss of her second child.

V. 26. *And to Seth, to him also there was born a son ; and he called his name Enosh :*

which means simply, " man : "

*then began men to call upon the name of (Jehovah).**

* This instance shows how dangerous it is to alter wittingly a single word of Holy Writ. The reviser or copyist who introduced the name "Jehovah," did so in perfect good faith. Knowing that the Jehovah whom the Israelites worshipped was the same Person as the El of the original text, he altered El in most passages where it occurred, into Jehovah, almost mechanically, supposing that this could not affect the sense. Yet the result was that in the passage before us he made a most significant sentence completely meaningless.

These words, as they now stand, are unintelligible. As we have seen, not only was the Sabbath known in all probability to our first parents from the beginning, but a place had been appointed where they might be assured of the presence of God, and might worship before Him ; and we have an actual instance of such worship, in the sacrifices of Cain and Abel. It cannot be therefore, that there was no worship of the Deity or no public recognition of Him, before the birth of Enosh, that is to say probably before the year 435 since the birth of Adam. Nor can the words mean that it was at this time that men began to invoke the Deity under the name of Jehovah, for that name was not revealed till some thousands of years later. But we have simply to replace the name for which, as we have suggested, Jehovah has in this chapter been substituted, to get an excellent sense. *Then began men to call upon the name of El.* Hitherto men had known and worshipped the Deity without venturing to think of Him by any special name, but at this time he made Himself known, probably to Adam, by the name of El. What men needed to learn in primitive ages was that God was a Mighty One ; stronger than all the forces of nature ; stronger than all the bodily might, than all the strength and persistence of will, and all the ungovernable passions of man ; stronger, too, than all his cunning devices, his vast intellect, and far-reaching designs. Only so could they be preserved from idolatry, and from worshipping the creature instead of the Creator ; and all this the name *El* brought home to them, especially with its adjunct “ Shaddai,”—“most powerful,” “almighty.” There is a remarkable confirmation of this explanation of the words. It appears from the narrative, that Seth, and Cain’s eldest son, Enoch, must have been born within a few years of each other. Hence we may infer that Enosh, the eldest son of Seth, and Irad, the eldest son of Enoch, were nearly contemporaneous. But it was after the birth of Enosh that God’s name, El, was first made known and used

by men in worship ; thus it could not have been employed in the name of a person, until the time when we find it actually used in the name of Mechujael, Irad's son.

And still further, this enables us to give an approximate date to the birth of Mechujael. If we take the dates given in the fifth chapter of Genesis according to the Septuagint Version, which there are reasons for supposing is on this point the most correct, the birth of Enosh was 435 years after the birth of Adam. Hence Mechujael could not have been born before that time, and perhaps we may fix his nativity approximately at the year 445.

We have now to consider what the probabilities are as regards the authorship of the narrative contained in this fourth chapter. It is clear that there is only one person who could have known at first hand what Eve said on the birth of each child.

Again, there is only one person to whom Cain is likely to have made confession of his murder of Abel, and the doom which was pronounced upon him as its expiation. In both cases that person was Adam. Again, we seem to see in the particulars given concerning Cain and his descendants, the heart of the father sorrowing for his banished first-born, treasuring every indication of his having come to a better mind, and rejoicing at the news of the intellectual vigour, and progress in material civilisation displayed by him and his descendants. We have no hesitation, therefore, in assigning the composition of this narrative to Adam ; and if so, several important results directly follow. In the first place, there could have been no such separation between Cain and his descendants and the rest of the family of Adam, as is often supposed. It is not at all likely, for instance, that the progress in the arts, appliances, and conveniences of life made by Cain and his descendants, was kept to themselves and not communicated to, and made use of by, the rest of Adam's race. For the author of the narrative evidently knows all about them, and must

apparently have been intimate with Lamech's family. On the other hand, we see that the religious progress made by the revelation of the name El, was soon accepted and reverently applied by the descendants of Cain. So that there is no ground for thinking of one race as being godless, immoral, and vicious, while the other comprised all the worshippers of the true God ; or that there was any permanent separation of mankind into two sections, which kept aloof from each other.

Secondly, if our supposition as to the authorship of this record be correct, we can go a little further in our approximate chronology. Adam, we are told in the next chapter, died at the age of 930, so that if this record proceeded from him, its composition cannot have been later than some years before that time ; say about the year 900 A.M. On the other hand, he died between the birth of Mahalalel, his fourth descendant, and that of Jared, the fifth. Now assuming that Seth is contemporaneous with Enoch, then Enosh will be contemporaneous with Irad, Kenan with Mechujael, and Mahalalel with Methusael. Hence we arrive at the conclusion that all that Adam narrates about Methusael's son, Lamech, and his children must have occurred not far from the end of Adam's life ; so that we cannot put the deeds of Lamech and his family much later than 900 A.M. Now, as we have said already, it is not likely that Cain was able to build his city till after Tubal-Cain had brought his tools to some perfection. We may, therefore, put the building of the first city on earth, the city Enoch, about the year 900 A.M.* It would follow, too, that the passing away of what must be called, we suppose, the neolithic age, and the introduction of, first of all, bronze, and then, somewhat later, iron implements and weapons, may have been going on from about the year 850 to 900 A.M.

* It is a most remarkable thing that neither the founding nor the name of any other city is mentioned in Holy Scripture, till the building of Babel about seventeen hundred years afterwards.

Probably even after 900 years, Adam had not gained the means of committing his narrative to writing ; but we are persuaded that the facts contained in it, no less than those related in the previous chapters, were not left to be kept in memory by uncertain tradition, which we know soon distorts such facts into mythical misrepresentations, but were drawn up in a formal document which parents, who recognised their responsibilities, were careful to impress upon their children. Adam must have been conscious of the immense importance of these “origines” of mankind, and it is not a very far-fetched supposition that he did what he could to preserve the memory of them.*

* It must be noticed that no writer of the Old Testament uses the first person when speaking of himself in narrative, except when recording his own utterances, until as late as the Prophet Isaiah ; it is therefore no objection to his having been the author of the record we have been considering, that Adam speaks of himself throughout it in the third person.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE ADAMIC PERIOD.

[It must be understood that the dates here given can
only be approximately true.]

A.M.

—	Birth of ADAM.
5	Removal of Adam from his parents.
105	The Settling of Adam in Paradise.
—	The Formation of Eve.
106	The Fall, and Expulsion from Paradise.
110	Birth of CAIN.
130 (cir)	Birth of ABEL.
220	Death of Abel and Flight of Cain.
230	Birth of SETH.
— (cir)	Birth of Cain's Son, ENOCH.
435	Birth of ENOSH.
440	Revelation of God's Name, El.
445	Birth of MECHUJAEL.
650 (cir)	Birth of LAMECH.
750-800	Birth of Lamech's Children.
850-900	Passing away of the Neolithic Age.
900	Building of the City of ENOCH.
930	Death of Adam.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A. (See p. 32.)

Dr. Pusey, in his "Lectures on Daniel," in the Note at the bottom of the eighteenth page of the Preface to the third edition, writes, "The substantive verb not being used in Hebrew as a mere copula, had Moses intended to say that the earth was 'waste and desolate,' when God created it, the idiom for this would have been 'Ve-haahretz tohu bohu,' omitting the verb ;" and he goes on to argue that "the insertion of the past verb, 'hayethah,' has no force at all, unless it be used to express what was the condition of the earth in the past time previous to the rest of the narrative, but in no connection at all with what preceded."

On the other hand, Gesenius, under the word "hayah," asserts that it "often joins the subject to the predicate, whether this latter be a substantive or an adjective ;" and he gives this very verse (Genesis i. 2), among other passages, as an example. But the instances given do not appear to prove his assertion, and Dr. Pusey seems to be right in stating that the substantive verb "hayah" is not "used in Hebrew as a mere copula," but always implies something more than this. It does not however follow that it need imply what Dr. Pusey represents as its meaning here. It is often used to express that the condition which it introduces is a *permanent* one, a lasting state of the subject. For instance, in Genesis iii. 1, we have "vehannachash hayah 'arum,"* "Now the serpent was sagacious," which means,

* The reversed comma (‘) is used to represent the Hebrew letter "ayin," the sound of which can hardly be pronounced by an English mouth.

of course, that such was the permanent nature of the serpent, not some peculiarity belonging to it at that moment. The use of "hayethah" in Genesis i. 2, is fully justified, if we translate "the earth was in a state of."

APPENDIX B.

(See p. 38.)

Gesenius in his Lexicon describes "raqia'" as "the firmament of heaven spread out like an hemisphere above the earth like a splendid and pellucid sapphire, to which the stars were supposed to be fixed, and over which the Hebrews believed there was a heavenly ocean." Similarly under the word "shamayim," he writes, "Heaven," *i.e.*, "firmament," which seems to be spread out like a vault over the globe, as supported on foundations and columns, whence the rain is let down as through doors or floodgates, and above which the abode of God and the angels was supposed to be." Now the idea that this was the belief of the Hebrews and of the Semites generally, depends upon whether certain expressions which they used are to be taken literally, or regarded as metaphors, symbolical representations, and figures of speech. Knowing what we now do of the advanced civilisation of the ancient Babylonians and Accadians, and especially of their great progress in astronomical observation, it seems impossible to believe that they were not perfectly aware that the rain descended from the clouds which floated in the atmosphere, and that the birds of heaven, as they are called in the Bible, skimmed the surface of the air, both at an enormous distance from the heavens in which the stars shone out. But after all, the question is, not what the Semites or others believed in later times, but what the Author of the Record of Creation actually meant to convey.

The "firmament" of the English versions is no doubt taken from the "firmamentum" of the Vulgate; and that

again is probably derived from the Septuagint translation “στερέωμα,” which implies something firm and solid. Thus an error once started has been handed down for nearly two thousand years.

APPENDIX C. (See p. 63.)

The translation of the English versions is *on the seventh day*. It will be at once seen that this makes an apparent contradiction with the last verse of the first chapter, where, after the creation of man had been described, we read, *There was evening and there was morning, a sixth day*, implying that the work of creation was finished on the sixth day. That being so, God could not have finished that work on the seventh day. How is this difficulty to be explained? The Samaritan and the Septuagint versions both get out of it by changing “seventh” in verse 2 into “sixth.” Yet it is not likely that this could have been the original reading, because there would have been no reason for altering “sixth” into “seventh,” and so creating an obvious difficulty, while there would be a considerable temptation to change “seventh” into “sixth” in order to get out of one. The true explanation, we think, lies in the double sense of the Hebrew word translated “in” (“b-”). Ordinarily it means that the act or thing to which it applies took place, or is situated, within a particular division of time or space. But it may also mean that the action or thing to which it refers is outside a certain division of time or space, but goes close up to it. For instance (I. Samuel xxix. 1.)—*The Israelites pitched by (“b-”) the fountain which is in Jezreel*. It may even imply that the action referred to takes place *immediately after* the time mentioned. Thus, in Numbers, Chapter xxviii. verse 26, we find in the Old Version, the words *In the day of the first-fruits, when ye bring a new meat offering unto the Lord, after your weeks (be out)*, where the word “after” is a translation of the Hebrew “b-.” And by referring to Leviticus, Chapter xxiii., verses 15, 16, 17, we see that the

day of the first-fruits was the day *after* the reckoning of seven weeks. The Authors of the Revised Version, not recognising this sense of "b-" have altered the passage in Numbers to *In the day of the first-fruits, when ye offer a meat offering unto the Lord, "in" your (feast of) weeks;* but it is clear that in this instance the Old Version was right. Thus "b-" has the sense of "with," "by," or "at," in addition to the ordinary meaning, "in"; and such, we make no doubt, was the sense in the verses under consideration. The creation of man was, indeed, finished on the sixth day, but it was only just before the commencement of the seventh. The work of the sixth day had been sufficiently important and complicated to take up the whole, not merely of the daylight, but also of the night-time of the sixth day. And if this is the true explanation, we arrive at a remarkable analogy between the creation of man and the re-creation of the second Adam, the Lord Jesus Christ. For as the creation of the first Adam went on until close upon the sunrise of the seventh day, which God hallowed in memory of the conclusion of the work, so it is evident that in the darkness of the night, only a short time before the sun rose on the first day of the week, the second Adam was raised "by the glory of the Father" to eternal life.

APPENDIX D.

(See p. 97.)

Assuming that the material taken from Adam's body had attached to it a cell which under favourable circumstances would be capable of reproducing the entire human frame, and that the substance taken was reduced to such a form that it could supply nutriment to that cell, we can imagine that the building up of a female infant, and the rapid development of the child into a full-grown woman, would not be beyond the scope of Divine surgery and chemistry.

THE NOACHIC NARRATIVE.

PART II.—THE NOACHIC NARRATIVE.]

CHAPTER V.

THE DESCENT OF MAN FROM ADAM TO NOAH.]

We have traced the progress of mankind during the lifetime of the first man. We have seen that, instead of the race beginning in savagery and superstition, its progenitor must have been well endowed spiritually and morally ; and that even as regards temporal and material civilization he started with the possession of a few cattle, sheep and goats, some knowledge of agriculture, and probably stone implements, such as would enable him to construct a rude habitation, and to fabricate some simple clothing. Finally, before the death of Adam, means had been discovered for shaping and sharpening the most easily found and easily wrought metals ; tents and other appliances for pursuing the nomadic life had been devised ; music and poetry had been invented ; and lastly, God had revealed Himself as One Who would punish wrong-doing, and Whose almighty power it was good for men to keep ever in mind.

We now go on to learn what we can of the progress of the race till it ended in a great catastrophe.

V. 1. *This is the book of the generations of man.*

The original is *generations of Adam* : but it must be noticed that the Hebrew word Adam, without the article, may mean either *man*, or the particular man, Adam. We are inclined to infer, from what follows, that it here denotes man generally.

This is the book. This is the first place in the Hebrew where we have an indication of the existence of written language ; in the Septuagint we find it earlier. The words in chapter ii. 4, which in the Hebrew are *These*

are the generations of the heaven and of the earth, are in the Septuagint, *This is the book of the generation of heaven and earth*, and we think there can be little doubt that when these headings were prefixed to the separate portions of the narratives, those portions had been reduced to written documents. But this would of course throw no light upon the question, whether the records themselves as originally composed were delivered in writing, or merely orally. We think it is certain that Adam did not bring the art of writing with him from the celestial abode where we have supposed that he was brought up. We infer this from the comparative clumsiness of the earliest attempt at expressing ideas in writing, as well as from the naturalistic way in which those methods appear to have been evolved. If we examine carefully our modes of thinking, we find that there are at least three different ways in which ideas present themselves to our minds. Sometimes the sound of a word which expresses the idea occurs to us ; sometimes the *written* word ; and very frequently no word at all, but the image of a thing about which we are thinking is presented to us. Where the last of these is the case, it is often the merest sketch or faintest suggestion of the image that occurs to us. It is obvious that primitive man would not easily discover a method of recording ideas by means of symbols of the sound of the words expressing them ; he could not use the suggestion of written words when writing was not yet invented ; there only remained, then, the very natural attempt to record ideas by means of the images of the things containing them or connected with them. How original this method of thinking is, becomes evident when we consider the case of animals, which evidently pursue trains of thought without having, as far as we are aware, anything but the images of things to help them. We are led then to the conclusion that when man began to record ideas which he wished to preserve, he would do it by means of what are called ideographs,

or picture-writing ; that is by some attempt to delineate the things and actions which he wished to describe. And this, we find as a fact, was the nature of the earliest attempts at writing. Egyptians, Accadians, and Chinese, all started with ideographic characters ; the first of these retained them with modifications, to a late period, and the last appear to be still using them.

This is the book of the generations of man.

We would remind the reader that the word “ generations ” denotes not merely the succession, but also the annals of those to whom it relates.

In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him ;

V. 2. *male and female created He them ; and blessed them, and called their name Man, in the day when they were created.*

He called their name Man, when He said, *Let us make Man*, and afterwards in creating, differentiated man, into male and female. This quotation from the first chapter, proves that the author of the narrative contained in chapter v. had the record of the Creation in his mind.

V. 3. *And Adam lived two hundred and thirty years, and begat (a son).*

We have adopted the reading of the Septuagint ; the Hebrew as we have it at present gives the period as *one* hundred and thirty years, and there is a similar discrepancy throughout this chapter ; the time of the birth of each first son being put one hundred years later in the Septuagint than in the Hebrew ; and on the other hand, one hundred years being deducted from the interval of time between the birth of that son and the father's death, so as to make no difference in the two accounts of the length of the entire life of each Patriarch. Thus in the present instance, Adam in the Hebrew is said to have lived *one* hundred and thirty years, and in the Septuagint *two* hundred and thirty years, before the birth of Seth : to have lived after the birth of Seth, according to the Hebrew,

eight hundred years, but according to the Septuagint, *seven* hundred years ; and so to have died at the age of nine hundred and thirty years by the reckoning of both versions,

Let us now state the reasons why we have throughout this genealogy given the numbers according to the Septuagint. We derive no assistance with regard to this matter from the Samaritan version ; for while it agrees for the most part with the Hebrew in the dates before the flood, it agrees with the Septuagint in the genealogical list after that event ; and sometimes differs from them both : but we may derive some guidance from the following considerations.

In the first place, if there is any truth in the account given in the first part of this work of the birth and education of Adam, the date assigned in the Hebrew for the birth of Seth, namely 130 A.M., can hardly be correct. For it will be seen from the chronological table given at the end of the First Part, that *Abel* was, in all probability born when Adam was about an hundred and thirty years old, and between that and the birth of Seth we have to allow time for the growth of Abel to manhood, the murder of Abel, and flight of Cain, which would hardly occupy altogether much less than an hundred years, bringing the date of Seth's birth to the year 230 A.M., as given in the Septuagint.

Secondly, it must be noticed that in three instances, namely, those of Enoch, Lamech, and Noah, the Hebrew agrees or nearly agrees with the Septuagint ; and in these cases the agreement is produced, not by the Septuagint reckoning being diminished down to the level of the Hebrew, but by the reckoning of the Hebrew being raised to that of the Septuagint.

Thirdly, it is a scientific fact that there is some relation between the age of arriving at maturity and the total length of life. At present, putting the time of complete and perfect development in man at the age of twenty-five, and the length of life of a healthy man at seventy-five, we see that the latter

is three times the former. Now the average age of maturity of the antediluvian patriarchs is about one hundred and sixty years, as given by the Septuagint, while as given by the Hebrew it is only sixty years. If then, we apply the above ratio to the Septuagint dates we get about five hundred years for the average duration of life, while by the same method, applied to the Hebrew, we get only about two hundred years for its length. Evidently, while each result is too small, according to the present standard, for the average length of life actually given, the Septuagint calculation agrees much more nearly with it than that of the Hebrew.

*And Adam lived two hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness after his image ; and called his name Seth.**

As Adam was made in the image and likeness of God,† when he begat a son in his own likeness and image, that son inherited the image and likeness of God. But since that image was now marred through Adam's transgression, it was reproduced in Seth, with the same disfigurement.

V. 4. *And the days of Adam after he begat Seth amounted to seven hundred years : and he begat sons and daughters.*

Here, for the first time, we have it mentioned that Adam was the father of daughters, as well as sons ; although it has been implied that this was the case, in order that the sons might have wives.

V. 5-8. *And all the days that Adam lived amounted to nine hundred and thirty years : and he died. And Seth lived two hundred and five years, and begat Enosh : ‡ and Seth lived after he begat Enosh seven hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters : and all the days of Seth amounted to nine hundred and twelve years : and he died.*

* For the meaning of this name see Part I., p. 129.

† See Part I., pp. 57, 58.

‡ See Part I., p. 129.

V. 9. *And Enosh lived an hundred and ninety years, and begat Kenan :*

This name means a “ possession ” : so that we have here a recurrence to the idea in Eve’s mind when her first son was born, and she exclaimed, *I have gained a man with God.**

V. 10-11. *and Enosh lived after he begat Kenan seven hundred and fifteen years, and begat sons and daughters : and all the days of Enosh amounted to nine hundred and five years : and he died.*

V. 12. *And Kenan lived an hundred and seventy years and begat Mahalalel :*

This name signifies “ Praise of God ; ” denoting, no doubt, the thankfulness of the parents at the birth of this child.

V. 13-14. *and Kenan lived after he begat Mahalalel seven hundred and forty years, and begat sons and daughters : and all the days of Kenan amounted to nine hundred and ten years : and he died.*

V. 15. *And Mahalalel lived an hundred and sixty-five years, and begat Jared :*

This word merely means “ descent,” which seems to have no particular significance, and merely to indicate a lack of invention on the part of the parents.

V. 16-17. *and Mahalalel lived after he begat Jared seven hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters : and all the days of Mahalalel were eight hundred ninety and five years : and he died.*

V. 18-20. *And Jared lived an hundred and sixty two years, and begat Enoch :† and Jared lived after he begat Enoch eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters : and all the days of Jared amounted to nine hundred sixty and two years : and he died.*

V. 21. *And Enoch lived one hundred and sixty-five years and begat Methuselah :*

This name is generally interpreted “ man of a dart ” ; as if the latter part of it were derived from

* See Part I., p. 117.

† See Part I., p. 124.

the word signifying “ missile ” (Hebrew, “ shelach ”). But this appears a senseless name to give to a new-born babe, and it seems especially unlikely that such a man as Enoch, whose own name meant “ instructed,” should have given such a name to his first-born son. We would suggest that the name is really the Hebrew “ methu-sha-leäch ” signifying “ man of vigour ; ” implying that the babe was a remarkably fine child, and likely to prove a strong healthy man. We know that this presentiment was fulfilled ; for Methuselah was the longest-lived of Adam’s descendants.

V. 22. *and Enoch walked with The God after he begat Methuselah two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters :*

The words *walked with The God*, imply that Enoch held constant communion with God, and sought to do His will in all things. And as this fact is mentioned directly after the birth of Methuselah, we may perhaps infer that the birth of his first-born son awakened in Enoch a deeper sense of responsibility, and a greater anxiety to live a godly life, than he had even before ; so that from this time he became a truly saintly man.

V. 22-24. *And all the days of Enoch amounted to three hundred and sixty-five years : and Enoch walked with The God : and he was not ; for God took him.*

These last words, so different from the usual ending, *and he died*, show that there was something extraordinary and supernatural in the departure of Enoch. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Hebrews xi. 5) expresses it, *Enoch was translated that he should not see death : and he was not found, because God translated him.* But we must particularly notice another fact in this most striking account of Enoch, which is missed in both the English versions. The words are not *he walked with God*, but *he walked with The God* ; and this reveals to us the fact that mankind by that time had fallen into idolatry, and were worshipping a number of created beings, so that it was

necessary to distinguish the one true God, as “The God.”

From the inveterate propensity of the human race to worship other things besides, or instead of, the One God, we might have inferred that men before the Flood had fallen into this sin ; and the state of moral corruption which led to that catastrophe, would render the supposition almost certain. But it is most remarkable that throughout the Book of Genesis, both here and everywhere else, the mention of any false god, or of any worship paid to such a god, is carefully avoided :* so that though we have positive proof that during a part of the time covered by that Book, the grossest idolatry was being practised, yet the writers of the Book only make us aware of the fact indirectly, and as it were unintentionally. The reason is, no doubt, that these worshippers of “The God,” being pressed and tempted by false belief and false worship on every side, could only maintain their faith by cherishing a horror of every form of false worship, leading them to shrink from all mention of it, and of the false gods who were its objects.

V. 25-27. *And Methuselah lived an hundred and eighty-seven years, and begat Lamech : † and Methuselah lived after he begat Lamech seven hundred and eighty-two years, and begat sons and daughters : and all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years : and he died.*

V. 28-29. *And Lamech lived an hundred and eighty-eight years and begat a son : and he called his name Noah, saying This same shall comfort us after*

* There appears to be only one exception to this rule, when Jacob, being directly commanded by God to go up and worship him at Bethel, found it necessary to purge his household from the taint of false worship, which they had brought with them probably from Paddan-aram. Genesis xxxv. 1-5. Here the mention of “strange gods” could not be avoided.

† For the meaning of Lamech, see Part I., p. 125.

our work, and after the toil of our hands, because of the ground which (Jehovah) has cursed.*

The name Noah signifies “rest.” It might, perhaps be thought that the idea was, that when this child grew up he would take his part in the labour of tilling the ground, and so lighten it for his father. But the words *This same shall comfort us*, implying that the benefit would be shared by both his parents, seem to make it refer to the relaxation which they would have when Lamech came back in the evening from toiling in the fields, and could enjoy domestic felicity in caressing this child. The expressions which Lamech uses with regard to the arduous nature of his work in tilling the soil, lead us to suppose that, as time went on and the wickedness of mankind increased, the effects of the curse originally pronounced had become more and more conspicuous; so that it was only by hard and continuous labour that men could wring a subsistence from the earth.

V. 30-31. *And Lamech lived after he begat Noah, five hundred and ninety-five years, and begat sons and daughters: and all the days of Lamech amounted to seven hundred seventy and seven years: and he died.*

V. 32. *And Noah became a son of five hundred years;* This remarkable expression perhaps denotes that Noah became what five hundred years of life made him; the product, as it were, of all that long experience.

and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

It is of some importance to try and determine the relative ages of these three sons. They were all born after Noah was five hundred years old, and evidently Shem was the eldest. Now we are told in Genesis xi. 10, that *Shem was an hundred years old when he begat Arpachshad two years after the flood.* Since, then,

* We must remind the reader that wherever the word Jehovah occurs in the book of Genesis, it has been substituted by the reviser for some other name of God which was originally in the text,—almost certainly for *El*.

the flood commenced after Noah had completed his six hundredth year, Shem must have been born when Noah was five hundred and two years old ; but it is not so easy to determine either the date or the order of the birth of the two younger sons. In chapter ix. 24, Ham is called, according to the authorised version, Noah's " younger " son, but according to the revised version, his " youngest " son, and the expression used in the Hebrew may be translated either way. This, therefore, leaves it doubtful whether Ham was the youngest of the three sons, or only younger than Shem. But as we find that whenever the three sons are mentioned together, as in the text, the order is Shem, Ham, and Japheth, though there might possibly be other reasons for their being so arranged, we think that on the whole it is most probable that Ham was the second son. With regard to the time of their birth, we may notice that all three were married when the Flood occurred ; for we read in vii. 13, that the three wives of his sons went with Noah and his wife into the Ark. Now, since the age of maturity could not, as we have seen, have been at that time much less than a hundred years, it follows that all the sons must have been born pretty near the beginning of the century before the Flood. Furthermore, as we shall see presently, it seems probable that Noah had daughters as well as sons ; so that, remembering that the interval between the birth of successive children must have been much greater in those days than at present, we may conjecture that the times of the birth of Noah's three sons stood somewhat as follows :—Shem, after the five hundred and second year of Noah's life ; Ham, after the five hundred and twelfth year ; and Japheth, after the five hundred and twenty-second year ; leaving room for the birth of a daughter between that of Shem and Ham ; of another between Ham and Japheth ; and probably a third after the birth of Japheth. This would make the youngest son about eighty years old at the time of the Flood.

As we shall see further on, Noah married late in life, almost certainly in consequence of a Divine intimation that through his family the race of man was to be preserved in the judgment which was impending. Knowing therefore that the earth was to be re-peopled by his children, it seems probable that he would give to each child, when he was born, some name which would be appropriate to him as one of the ancestors of the human race. The word Shem, in Hebrew, means first of all, simply "name," but it has the secondary meaning of a "famous name," and so denotes "fame" or "renown." It was in this sense, no doubt, that Noah gave the name to his first-born son: he would be in due time the head of the human family, and the memory of him would be handed down, as we know has been the case, to all future generations.

When the second son was born, a marked peculiarity suggested the name by which he should be designated. Apparently he was of a much darker colour than was usual in men of that time; and Noah, foreseeing that this peculiarity would be reproduced in his children, called him Ham (Hebrew, "Cham"), meaning "brown" or "dark."*

Lastly, probably with prophetic insight into the future, Noah named his third son Japheth (Hebrew, "Yapheth"), which means "wide-spread."

Let us now see in what way the genealogical annals

* The Hebrew word "Cham" is never used elsewhere in any other sense than that of "hot"; but from this sense there must have arisen in very early times a secondary meaning, "blackened," or "browned," by heat. That this was so is proved by the existence of another word "Chum," which always means "brown" or "dark." Probably, originally, the word "Cham" was the only one, and was used in both senses, to denote "hot," and "blackened," by heat; but after a time the word was pronounced a little differently to indicate the second meaning, so that there came to be two distinct words. Compare the use of "nōtable" in the sense of "distinguished," and "nǒtable" in the sense of "housewifely."

given in this chapter may have been composed and preserved. In order to render this point perfectly clear, we may set down the following dates :—

	A.M.
Birth of Mahalalel	795
Death of Adam	930
Birth of Noah	1662
Death of Mahalalel	1690

It will be seen at once that Mahalalel was contemporaneous with his great great grandfather, Adam, for one hundred and thirty-five years. Again, Noah was contemporaneous with Mahalalel for twenty-eight years. Thus, there was only one link intervening between Noah and Adam. Now we may be sure that Adam, knowing the immense importance of the early records of the race which was springing from him, would be most careful to instruct each of his direct descendants in his lifetime in the most important facts and dates of the previous history. The documents already composed, and the dates of the births and deaths which had already occurred, would not be too long a record to be impressed on the memory of each child as he grew up ; and we may imagine Mahalalel standing before his great ancestor and being taught by him to repeat these records word by word, just as a child now stands before his father or his mother and is taught to repeat the Church Catechism. Mahalalel, in his turn, would repeat this instruction in the case of each of his direct descendants ; and thus it would come about that Noah would know the whole story of what had gone before with the most infallible certainty. By the time when Noah was three hundred and thirty-eight years old, mankind would have been on the earth two thousand years ; and considering the progress which we have seen made in the arts at a very much earlier period,* it seems impossible that

* See Part I., pp. 126, 127.

some method of writing should not have been invented by this time. Having this additional mode of recording the memory of past events, Noah would certainly make use of it, and preserve the record, not merely by impressing it upon the memory of each of his children, but also by carefully-written documents.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RECORD OF THE INCREASING CORRUPTION OF THE HUMAN RACE AND OF THE DOOM PRONOUNCED UPON MANKIND BY ALMIGHTY GOD.

V. 1-2. *And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair ; and they took them wives of all that they chose.*

The note of time here given is extremely indefinite, and we must try to arrive at some approximate date. Now it is not likely that the awful temptation here recorded arose till mankind had become addicted to the worship of other things, besides, or instead of, the one true God. But it is probable that idolatry would not begin, or at any rate make much progress, before the death of Adam, A.M. 930.* By the time, however, of Enoch—say A.M. 1287, when his first child was born,—there is an intimation, as we have seen, that idolatry was firmly established.† Let us suppose then that the intermingling of the two diverse races here spoken of commenced about the year 1200 ; by which time mankind would have become sufficiently numerous to justify the expression *men began to multiply on the face of the ground*. Who then were the seducers of the daughters of the human race ? They are described as *the sons of God*. Now the Hebrew expression of which this is the translation (*beni-haëlohim*) occurs in only three other places in the

* Compare Judges, ii. 8-11, And Joshua, the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died, . . . and all that generation were gathered unto their fathers : and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the Lord, nor yet the work which He had wrought for Israel : and the children of Israel did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, and served the “ Baalim.”

† See pp. 147, 148.

Hebrew Bible, all of which are in the Book of Job. In Job i. 6, we read, *there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them*, and the same words occur in chapter ii. 1. We think it will be generally allowed that the expression *sons of God* must there mean the Angels; and the next passage seems to make this meaning certain. In chapter xxxviii. 4-7, we find the words *Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth . . . when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy*; which must surely denote the exultation of the Angels when the glorious work of Creation was commenced. And the interpretation of the phrase *sons of God* thus suggested is confirmed by the constant tradition of the Jewish Church, and indeed of the Semitic people generally. In the Epistle of St. Jude the 6th and 7th verses, we read of *Angels which kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation*; and then of *Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, having in like manner with these given themselves over to fornication, and gone after strange flesh*. There can be no kind of doubt that St. Jude is here speaking of Angels who left their heavenly dignity and condition that they might cohabit with mortal women.* This meaning of the narrative in Genesis was never doubted till the time of St. Augustine of Hippo. Staggered, no doubt, by the greatness of the mystery, he first suggested a different explanation. He considered that the *sons of God* meant the descendants of Seth, who, he supposed, had preserved the worship of the true God, and remained at any rate, comparatively pure; that by the *daughters of men* was intended the women of the race descended from Cain, who had become idolatrous and

* Once again, at the end of the World, it would seem that this mystery of iniquity is to be repeated in a horrible parody of the Incarnation; when a woman shall be found ambitious enough, bold enough, base enough, to become the mother of the Antichrist, Satan's own son.

corrupt; that these two races had hitherto kept aloof from each other, the former avoiding contamination from intercourse with the latter; but that now the beauty of the women descended from Cain proved too attractive for the male descendants of Seth, so that they intermarried with the idolatrous women, and the corruption became general. It will be seen that this account of the matter rests entirely upon the idea that the descendants of Seth had kept themselves separate from those of Cain, and that the latter alone were immoral and godless. But we have seen reason to suppose that Cain himself, in spite of his great crime, was not an abandoned sinner,* and that his immediate descendants, as far as we can trace them, give indications of the fear of God, and of a sense of the retribution that awaits wrong-doing;† so that there is no reason to suppose that this race was specially depraved. Nor is there any better ground for the supposition that the two families remained distinct for any considerable period. Cain himself evidently expected that the time would come when he could no longer keep himself aloof from the rest of Adam's family; for he looked forward to a day when they would find him, and exact blood vengeance for his crime.‡ And that Adam himself, so far from seeking to forget Cain and his children, was well acquainted with them, and took an interest in their progress, is clear from the fact that he has recorded their names and doings with more particularity than those of his other immediate descendants.§ Thus it appears that St. Augustine's view is founded upon suppositions which are themselves baseless; that it is contrary to the constant tradition of the Israelites and other Semitic people; and that it does not agree with the usage of the Hebrew words by which the Scriptural

* See Part I., p. 123.

† See Part I., pp. 124, 125.

‡ See Part I., p. 123.

§ See Part I., pp. 131, 132.

narrative expresses what actually occurred. Unfortunately St. Augustine was not a Hebrew scholar, otherwise we think he would never have propounded such a view. Yet that view proved so attractive that it has prevailed from his time down to the present day ; and probably, even now, it will maintain itself for some time longer, and die hard, even if it dies out at all. The reason of this is that there is an enormous difficulty in believing the facts as they are recorded. Whether the Angels have some kind of body is a doubtful point ;—probably they have ; but what is not doubtful, is Our Lord's statement : *In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as Angels in heaven.* (St. Matthew xxii. 30.) These words render it impossible to suppose that, in their normal condition, and while conforming to the true law of their being, Angels are capable of marriage. But St. Jude, as we have seen, tells us that on the occasion we are considering Angels kept not τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχήν, *i.e.*,—*their first estate*, or original condition. (Jude, verse 6.) And in fact we find that, whenever in Holy Scripture Angels are represented as showing themselves to the waking eyes of men, they appear to have the body of a man. Moreover, this body is not a mere phantom or appearance, but a substantial one, having, as far as we can see, the usual capacities of the human body. In the account of the Lord's resurrection, for instance, we read that the women *entering into the tomb, saw a young man sitting on the right side arrayed in a white robe ; and they were amazed.* (St. Mark xvi. 5.) Clearly it is an Angel who is so described, and he is so completely like a man, that the women could discern that he was a “ *young man.* ” Again in St. Luke xxiv. 4, we are told that, while the women were perplexed at not finding the Lord's body, *two “ men ” stood by them in dazzling apparel.* Similarly in Acts i. 10-11, it is related that while the disciples were gazing intently into heaven as the Lord ascended, *behold two “ men ” stood by them in white apparel.*

The particular mention in all these cases of the *men* being clothed has an especial bearing upon the subject we are discussing, and the substantiality of the bodies thus assumed by angels is demonstrated by several other instances of their appearing. We read in I Kings xix. 5, that as Elijah *lay down and slept under a juniper tree, behold an angel "touched" him, and said unto him, Arise and eat.* And again in the 7th verse, *And the angel of the Lord came again the second time, and "touched" him, and said, Arise and eat.* So in St. Matthew's account of the resurrection, 28th chapter, 2nd verse, we are told, *An angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and "rolled away" the stone, and sat upon it,* denoting the putting forth of bodily grasp and vigour. Lastly, in the 12th chapter of Acts, 7th verse, we find that the angel of the Lord *"smote" Peter on the side, and awoke him, saying, Rise up quickly.* We may then affirm with some confidence that, whatever may be their condition in heaven, angels, when they come to this earth, can assume a body differing in no respect that can be discerned from the body of a man, and that this body is palpable to the touch, and requires to be clothed in suitable habiliments. It follows therefore, that however mysterious it may be, what is related in the passage we are considering accords with what is told us in other places in Holy Scripture about the condition of angels when appearing on this earth.

There remains one question. It may be asked why the author of the narrative we are considering, if he meant angels, did not employ the usual term for them, instead of using the somewhat ambiguous expression, *Sons of Elohim.* The answer is that the ordinary word for angel in Hebrew is "Malāk," which merely means "a messenger," and that the word did not acquire this special sense till long after the period when this narrative was written. Apparently the first place where the expression, "messenger (Malāk) of the Lord," is used of a supernatural

being, is in the 16th chapter of Genesis, 7th verse, where *the angel of the Lord* appears to Hagar as she is fleeing from the face of her mistress, Sarai. But even there it is almost certain from what follows, verses 8-13, that “*Malāk*” does not mean an “angel” in the ordinary sense, but either the Second or Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, sent forth by the Father to guide and comfort the oppressed and wandering woman: and the same may be said of the words, “the messenger (or angel) of the Lord,” wherever they occur during the lifetime of Abraham. The first passage in which we can be certain that the word “*Malāk*” denotes “angel” is in the account of Jacob’s dream in Genesis xxviii. 12-13. *And he dreamed and behold a ladder set up on earth, and the top reached to heaven, and behold “angels” of God ascending and descending on it: and behold the Lord stood above it:* but this was written more than three thousand years after the narrative on which we are engaged.

Having thus cleared the ground, let us try to draw from the actual words of that narrative some idea of what is really implied in the occurrence which they describe.

V. 2. *The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair;*

How did it come about that angels, sons of God “whose own habitation” was in heaven, had an opportunity of seeing the daughters of men. The obvious answer is that they had been sent by God to do His bidding in the affairs of this world, and especially, we may suppose, to watch over and protect these daughters of men. If so, what they did was a most abominable breach of trust. Next, we may notice that it is implied here that heavenly beings are susceptible to earthly beauty; * indeed it is evident

* Probably it is to this that St. Paul alludes in that very difficult passage (I. Corinthians xi. 10), where he directs that, in the worship of the Church, women shall wear some kind of hood or veil covering their head and neck (for this

throughout Holy Scripture that all God's rational creatures are closely allied to each other, and have the same senses, feelings and standards of excellence. Thirdly, it is very remarkable that the connections which these *sons of God* formed with mortal women were not casual or temporary, as we might have expected:

and they took them "wives" of all that they chose.

Probably they felt that they dare not return to their heavenly habitations after this flagrant breach of trust, and so took up their abode as permanent denizens of earth. How great must have been the attractiveness of those women who could make angels weigh heaven against earth, and for their sake deliberately choose the latter. As far as the women themselves were concerned, it is not difficult to imagine how the matter presented itself to them. They had almost certainly become the worshippers of beings other than the one true God. It seems to be of the nature of such idolatrous worship that it inflames those who give way to it with feelings of emotional devotion towards its objects, real or imaginary.* When, therefore, the angels of God presented themselves in a human form, the women would suppose that the beings whom they had been worshipping had appeared to them as a reward of their earnest and affectionate devotion, and would be pleased and flattered by this appreciation of it. And when these august beings began to make proposals to them, there would come in the motive, so natural to women,

probably is the sense of the Greek word translated in our versions, "power" or "sign of authority"), "because of the angels"; implying that the angels who are present at, and take part in, Christian worship, are capable of being attracted, and distracted, by the sight of feminine loveliness.

* Compare Ezekiel viii. 14, "Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord's house, which was towards the north; and behold there sat the women weeping for Tammuz."

of wishing to form an alliance above their proper station. The words used do not lead us to suppose that there was any reluctance on the one side or any need of violence on the other; *they took them wives* is just the ordinary phrase that is used when men enter into the estate of matrimony. Yet the expression, *all that they chose*, may perhaps give a hint that they did not stop to inquire whether the women whom they chose were or were not married or engaged to be married, or whether their kinsmen would approve of such a union. Such an incursion of an alien race into their families would almost certainly provoke among men fierce anger, leading to strife, contention, and perhaps actual bloodshed, and adding to the violence and wrong-doing already prevailing on the earth. But, however that may be, there can be no doubt that the intruders succeeded in establishing themselves and becoming permanently settled upon earth.

V. 3. *And (Jehovah) said, My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever, . . . yet shall his days be an hundred and twenty years.*

It is evident that this doom upon mankind could not have been pronounced immediately after the time to which what has gone before refers. For the space of an hundred and twenty years is not sufficient to allow for the development of the course of events implied in what is recorded in verse 4, where mighty men are spoken of who made extensive conquests. Probably we have here an instance of what has happened to mar the text of Holy Scripture in not a few places, viz., the transposition of words or sentences, so that they no longer come in the order in which they were originally written.* We will then defer the consideration of this verse 3, and take it after verse 6.

V. 4. *The giants were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the*

* See Appendix E, pp. 223, 224.

daughters of men and these bare to them the conquerors which were of old, the men of renown.

Evidently *those days* were the times immediately preceding the intrusion of the angels, that is as we have supposed about A.M. 1200, more than a thousand years before the Flood. It will be noticed that it was not the intermarriage of mortal women with the celestial visitants that first produced a monstrous progeny, for the giants were in the earth already : but strange as it may appear, the union of the earthly with the heavenly race proved fruitful, the daughters of men bare children to the sons of God, and those children became men of gigantic stature. It seems an almost certain conclusion that they were gigantic in intellect as well as in body. The region of the world in which men dwelt had become populous by that time, cities had been built, and states founded ; wars broke out, and military expeditions were undertaken. In these the children of the angels showed their prowess, and became mighty conquerors, whose renown was in everyone's mouth.

It is evident that this account was written long after the events which it relates ; for the mighty men spoken of are described as "*the*" *conquerors which were "of old"* "*the*" *men of renown*. The insertion of the article before *conquerors* and *men of renown*, and the expression *of old*, shows that those for whom this narrative was written had heard tell of these famous men as once existing upon the earth, but having long since passed away. The Flood had intervened and had swept away the whole race of those gigantic warriors. As we have said already, the state of things described, began in all probability more than a thousand years before the Flood, and Noah lived for three hundred and fifty years after that catastrophe : when, therefore, late in life probably, he was led to put on record for the benefit of the younger generations, the events which had occurred, all that had preceded the Flood was already ancient history.

V. 5. *And (Jehovah)* saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.*

As we have said, the sin of the angels could only have been committed when idolatry, and the immorality attendant upon it, already prevailed. How utterly depraved the angels would become in entertaining and yielding to the seduction to which they succumbed, may be estimated by the glory and excellence from which they fell. Their taking possession of things and persons to which they had no rightful claim, must have greatly increased the lawlessness, wrongdoing and violence, which probably existed previously. And, lastly, the offspring of such fathers and such mothers must have been depraved from their birth, and were not likely to be educated in a way which would make them any better. So that it is not to be wondered at that *the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth*. But how great it was we can only appreciate from the statement that *every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually*. There have been times and places since then at which the wickedness of men has been awful; but there has always been some redeeming point, something which showed that right feeling was not utterly extinct. But in this case there was nothing to relieve the darkness, the thoughts of man's heart were *only evil*, and that *continually*.

Therefore we read next,—

V. 6. *And it repented (Jehovah) that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart.*

This expression of regret and anguish is one of the most touching things in Holy Scripture. If it had been the fierce anger and wrath of God that had been spoken

* We would remind the reader that wherever the name Jehovah is now found in the Book of Genesis, it has been substituted by a later reviser for some name of God,—probably “El,” the “Mighty One,”—which was used by the original writer. (See Part I., pp. 70, 71.)

of, there would have been nothing surprising ; but to read of the Almighty being touched to the heart might make even the most careless pause and ponder. And let us beware of the explanations, senseless and irreverent as they are,—although those who put them forth do not think it,—by which most expositors explain these words away. As we saw at the beginning,* man was created in the image of God ; and as grief is not a sinful feeling, it could not have existed in man unless there had been the pattern of it in its highest form previously existing in the Creator. There must have been first of all the intense sorrow that beings who were capable of, and were made for, the noblest destiny, had sunk to such a depth of degradation. There must have been the deep anguish of seeing the misery which the wrong-doing, lust, cruelty, and oppression, which prevailed, brought in their train. There must have been, lastly, the heart-rending consciousness that this state of things could not go on, and that all the art, all the science, all the civilization, all the beauty and intellect, that had been evolved during centuries of progress must be swept away and utterly perish.† To compare great things with small, it was as if the painter of a magnificent picture had found that dark blotches were showing themselves all over it, and that there was nothing for it but to destroy the work of highest genius on which he had laboured for years. Here comes in, naturally, the verse 3, which has got transposed.

And (Jehovah) said, My Spirit shall not strive in mankind for ever in their going astray ;

It was not from want of Divine help and warning that men had fallen into their state of depravity. Throughout the whole time, God's Holy Spirit had been among them, striving to turn them back from their evil way ; but they had persistently resisted Him. And now the

* See Part I., pp. 57, 58.

† See comment on Chapter VII., v. 4.

time had come, as it must come to everyone who will not listen to the voice of God speaking within him, when the gracious influence which had proved ineffectual must be withdrawn. But even yet, as S. Peter tells us, *the long-suffering of God waited*. (I. Peter iii. 20.)

He,—i.e. man, is flesh, (so that I could sweep him away in an instant,) *yet shall his days be an hundred and twenty years.*

There were some few of the descendants of Enoch who had kept themselves aloof from the pollution of the world, and time was allowed for them to die out peacefully. Again there might be a few even of those who had gone astray who were not so hardened as the rest, and who, if more time was given them, might yet turn from their evil course. Moreover, the preparation necessary for the preservation of a small remnant of mankind would require considerable time. Therefore there was given a respite of an hundred and twenty years.

V. 7. *And (Jehovah) said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the ground ; both man, and beast, and creeping things, and fowl of the air ; for it repenteth me that I have made them.*

At this first declaration of the judgment of God it was not said how that judgment was to be executed ; but it was merely announced that all life must be swept away from the earth. To whom was this announcement made ? We are told immediately ;

V. 8. *But Noah found grace in the eyes of (Jehovah).*

This intimation must have changed the current of Noah's life. The flood came when he was six hundred years old (Genesis vii. 6), so that he was four hundred and eighty years old when the impending doom of mankind was made known to him, together with the assurance that, having found favour with God, he himself should be delivered from the destruction. At that time he had no children, and had probably remained unmarried. We may believe that he had seen most of his near kinsmen drawn into the tide of iniquity, and had determined that he would not be the father of

children who might share the same fate. But now the case was changed ; it was necessary that he should marry that a remnant of mankind might be preserved, and no doubt he received an intimation that such was the will of God. In all likelihood a God-fearing woman could only be found among his own nearest kin ; and such a one he espoused some time within the next twenty years ; for his eldest son, Shem, was born about one hundred years before the Flood. The circumstance of his remaining unmarried so long may have enabled Noah to accumulate wealth, and place himself in a position of great influence, if not of dignity and honour ; it is difficult to imagine otherwise how a man leading a righteous and blameless life, could have maintained himself unmolested in that world of violence and iniquity. Probably he was looked upon as an eccentric fanatic, harmless and trustworthy, but too powerful to be molested with impunity.

V. 9. *These are the annals of Noah.*

As we have explained before, this heading to the passage containing the history of Noah was probably prefixed to the original document by its author. The writer of that document was, probably, the author of the “Annals of Mankind,” which immediately preceded it, and verse 8, which concludes that account, stating that *Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord*, formed the transition from the one record to the other.

Noah was a righteous man ; blameless he showed himself in his generations :

In the five hundred years of his life Noah would have seen the rise of four generations, and in his intercourse with each of these his conduct had proved irreproachable.

Noah walked with The God.

This phrase is exactly the same as that which is used in the case of Enoch.* Now, as then, *The God* means the

* See Chapter V., v. 22, p. 147.

One true God, as opposed to the false objects of the idolatrous worship which was going on all around ; and to walk with Him gives the image of a child putting his hand in that of his father, and being guided by him whither he should go.

It may be asked, could Noah himself have written the sentences which give this description of his character and conduct ? We answer, yes ; if he was writing what God had directed him to write, and recording what God Himself had pronounced concerning him.

V. 10. *And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.*

This would make the time of what follows, as we have supposed, not earlier than the five hundred and twenty-second year of Noah's life, rather less than eighty years before the Deluge. The condition of the world had not improved in the forty years which had elapsed since God first warned Noah of the approaching doom. For we read next,—

V. 11. *And the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.*

Corruption, implying every kind of falsehood, fraud, and excess, and impurity ; and violence, indicating every sort of oppression, brutality and cruelty, had filled the earth.

V. 12. *And God saw the earth, and, behold it was corrupt ; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.*

By this time, probably, not a single person was left who had not been drawn into the vortex of iniquity except Noah and his children, and his father, Lamech, and his grandfather, Methuselah, who were still alive.

V. 13. *And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before Me ; for the earth is filled with violence through them ; and, behold. I will destroy them with the earth.*

The doom of mankind is pronounced for the second time ; but now the precise form it was to take, and the preparations which Noah was to make in order that he

and his family might be saved from it, are announced for the first time.

V. 14. *Make thee an ark of gopher wood ; cells thou shalt make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch.*

The first thing to be noticed here is, that Noah was not directed to build a ship, but an ark ; in other words, a chest or oblong box. It could therefore be built on any open level space ; nor, as we shall see, was any provision required for launching it. Nothing is said about masts, sails, or rudder, or of any means of propelling or guiding it. It was to be made of gopher wood, (*i.e.*, probably cypress). It was to be fitted up with a number of separate compartments, or cells ; no doubt to hold the various beasts who were to be brought into it ; and it was to be carefully covered with pitch inside and outside, that it might be as nearly as possible watertight.

V. 15. *And this is how thou shalt make it : the length of the ark three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits.*

The length of the common cubit used by the Jews in later times, varied an inch or two ; but a foot-and-half is near enough to represent it for ordinary purposes. But the cubit which was used in the building of temples and palaces, which was no doubt the ancient and original one, was about three inches longer ; so that we may, with some certainty, take the cubit here mentioned as being one foot nine inches in length. The dimensions of the ark then were very large, about 525 feet long, 88 feet wide, and 52 feet in depth ; this would give a tonnage of about 13,000 tons. The largest ship that has ever been constructed was the Great Eastern, designed by the late Mr. Brunel, the dimensions of which were, length, 680 feet ; breadth, 83 feet ; depth, 58 feet ; and tonnage, 18,915. But the largest ships which are being built at the present time have a tonnage of about fifteen thousand tons. Comparing

these dimensions with those of the ark, we get some idea of its vast size.

V. 16. *A light shalt thou make to the ark, and to a cubit's length shalt thou finish it (measuring) down from above ;*

It was not a *window* but a *light*. Probably it was an opening, extending all round the ark, measuring a cubit,—*i.e.* : as we have seen, one foot nine inches,—in depth, with proper supports at intervals to sustain what was above it. How this opening was glazed, or protected, so as to let in the light but exclude the rain and spray, we must in our ignorance of the appliances which men had in those days, leave uncertain ; but we may be sure that this opening was well above the water-line of the ark when loaded, and we may, with some probability, suppose that it was immediately under the upper deck.

and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof ; with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.

The huge vessel was to have three decks ; and as it will be seen from what has just been said, that the light was immediately below the upper deck, *i.e.* between the the first and second deck, it is evident that the persons and animals who were to inhabit it were to live on the second deck ; and we may conclude that the door also was to that deck. The upper deck would be uninhabitable, owing to the torrents of rain which, as we shall see, descended for forty days upon it. It was, in fact, only a covering to shelter the rest of the vessel ; and that it might serve to effect that purpose the better, it appears itself to have been sheltered by a tarpaulin, or some waterproof fabric, stretched tent-wise upon it. For in the 13th verse of the 8th chapter, we read that *Noah removed the covering of the ark ;* and the Hebrew word for *covering* (*mikseh*) is only used elsewhere for the outermost coverings of the Tabernacle, which are described as being of ram skins and seal skins. How ventilation

was to be procured for all that part of the vessel which was below the upper deck, we can only conjecture; probably the tent-like covering which protected the latter would render it possible to make ventilating shafts in it, free from the danger of being inundated by the wet.

V. 17. *And I, behold I do bring the Flood of waters upon the land, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under Heaven; every thing that is in the land shall die.*

Here, for the first time the exact nature of the catastrophe which was impending is declared. The Hebrew word by which the cataclysm is denoted, is never used for anything but the Flood of Noah. The uniqueness of the event is further emphasised by the use of the article, “*the*” *Flood*; implying that it was the only one which had occurred since man was upon the earth, or which would occur while he lived upon it. It was to be such an inundation as would sweep away all life, human and animal, in the area which it affected. Yet an exception was to be made, a remnant was to be saved of both; for the Divine message goes on—

V. 18. *But I will establish my covenant with thee and thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons’ wives with thee.*

Thus we learn that Noah’s three sons were to be married before the Flood came; and, no doubt, Noah would receive this as an intimation that he should take care to arrange for their being so. Probably in the condition in which the world then was, it would be impossible to find suitable wives for them outside his own family; and hence we may with some probability conjecture, that they—as the sons of Adam must have done—married their own sisters; and it is not improbable that Noah himself did the same. There are physiological reasons for believing that, under special circumstances, such unions would be in no way injurious; though if practised commonly, they would lead to a rapid deterioration of the race.

V. 19-20. *And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee ; they shall be male and female. Of the fowl after their kind, and of the beasts after their kind, of every creeping thing of the ground after its kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive.*

In this division the word *beasts* includes cattle of all kinds, and all the larger quadrupeds ; *creeping thing*, all the smaller animals, such as rabbits, mice, etc., as well as reptiles.

Here the question arises whether all these animals were to be brought to Noah miraculously, or whether he was to collect them by his own efforts. The only expression that might lead us to suppose that Noah was to use no exertion in obtaining them is, *two of every sort shall " come " unto thee* ; but this need not have any such meaning. It had been said before, *thou shalt come into the ark* ; (verse 18), and then (verse 19), *two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark* ; and then again, *two of every sort shall come unto thee*. Putting these directions together, the natural meaning is, that Noah himself, having entered the ark, and remaining there for the purpose of arranging everything, the animals were then by his order to be brought into the ark, and so were to " come " to him. Clearly Noah was to cause the ark to be built by his own exertions, instead of God making it for him miraculously ; and as we shall find immediately, he was ordered to take to him *of all food that is eaten*, instead of sustenance being provided for the inmates of the ark miraculously ; so that we have no reason or right, to assume that that which comes between these two things—the collecting of the animals which were to live in the ark, and eat the food,—had anything miraculous in it. We must then understand, that Noah was to collect, by immense expenditure and trouble, every kind of animal that he could get, and also to provide an enormous quantity of food for them. For we read in the next verse—

V. 21. *And take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten and gather it to thee ; and it shall be for food for thee and for them.*

The provision of food must have been a matter of immense difficulty, requiring a very large expenditure, not merely of money, but of forethought and ingenuity ; for the time spent in the ark was to be nearly a year. It would be comparatively easy to provide for the animals which live on vegetable productions : a year's supply of these would not be difficult to obtain ; and what means had been already invented for their compression and preservation we can only surmise. It must have been a much more complicated matter to provide food such as would sustain the carnivorous animals. We have no reason to suppose, as men had been already two thousand years upon the earth, that they were less full of resource than we are now. Still, to provide a supply of food, such as would keep in health for nearly a year what must probably have been, as we shall presently see, not less than twenty pairs of such animals, must have required great ingenuity, much previous trial, and possibly, long training beforehand of the animals themselves. Apparently no experiments have ever been made as to how far the larger carnivora can be sustained on flesh preserved by various processes. Again, nothing is known as to whether such animals can be induced to eat, and would thrive upon, fish, which it may have been easy to obtain as long as the ark was floating upon the waters. On the other hand, lions, tigers, and all meat-eating animals will drink milk in confinement. If we understand then that the command *Take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten*, included a larger number of the smaller animals, such as rabbits and other rodents, and perhaps of the lesser kind of deer ; a considerable number of milch cows ; and such kinds of preserved meats as it had been ascertained that the animals could be induced to take from time to time without injury ; and if it were proved by experiment that a

considerable number of them—as it is certain that some of them would—could eat fish in moderate quantities without being made ill by it; we think that the problem of feeding the carnivora in the ark would be solved. Naturally this immense supply of food would be stowed on the lowest deck, beneath that on which the persons and animals were to live. To carry out the directions which had been given to him, would require, as we have already observed, on Noah's part an immense expenditure of thought and money, extending over a long period of time. He would need all the aid he could get from his own family, besides the numerous agents, artisans and labourers whose services he could hire. It seems probable, therefore, that this great task was not laid upon him till all his children were old enough to help him in the execution of it. As we have seen, his family was probably composed of his own wife and three sons, and the three daughters who were to become their wives. As these were all born after Noah was five hundred years old, and probably not later than his five hundred and thirtieth year, they would all of them be of sufficient age to be serviceable about the five hundred and fiftieth year of Noah's life, that is to say about fifty years before the Flood came. In those years then, by the joint exertions of himself and his family, the great work which had been assigned to him was to be done; and when we consider all that it involved, the time, though it was ample, does not appear too long. There was the construction of the vast ark, with all the appliances and fittings necessary for light, ventilation and cleanliness, for the separate accommodation and sustenance of the multitude of animals, and of the eight human beings who were to be its inmates for so many months. Concurrently with this must have gone on the hunting and capturing of all the wild animals, and the learning how to keep them alive after they were captured. For this purpose Noah must have established a large menagerie and

carried on the management of it for a number of years. He must have accumulated quantities of the food on which they would have to live while shut up in the ark, and have learnt by experiment what the animals could be induced or taught to eat without detriment to their health. But besides all this, Noah, as St. Peter tells us, *was a preacher of righteousness* (II. Peter ii. 5). He could not allow all the rest of mankind to perish without warning them of the coming doom, and entreating them to repent. Year after year, as the time went on, the prophet of God must have co-operated with God's Spirit striving in man to turn them from their evil way. And as we learn from another passage in the first Epistle of St. Peter,* the warning voice, although it might have seemed to be unheeded at the time, was not without its effect. There were some who were sufficiently influenced by it, not indeed to avoid the coming doom, or to escape the further penalty of being confined as it were "in prison" after their death, yet not to be beyond the grace of God; so that they could hear the Saviour's voice when He was in Hades—a voice we may be sure which promised mercy and comfort.

Noah, in order to accomplish all this, must have been a man not only of strong faith and remarkable holiness, but also of great ability and resource, great wealth and power, and probably of very high position. Such a man could only have maintained himself in such a world, and have done such a work in the midst of it as Noah was called upon to accomplish, by the constant aid and protection of Almighty God. But he did accomplish it successfully and thoroughly: for we read,

V. 22. *Thus did Noah; according to "all" that God commanded him, so did he.*

* See I. Epistle S. Peter iii., 19-20.

CHAPTER VII.

THE RECORD OF THE DELUGE.

Fifty years as we have supposed have passed away,—years of continuous activity and exertion on the part of Noah and his family, in carrying out the preparations directed by the Almighty to be made, for the purpose of preserving themselves and a remnant of the animals, in the catastrophe that was impending. All was now ready, and the 120 years of grace were drawing to an end. Once more the Divine voice was heard giving the final directions.

V. 1. *And (Jehovah) said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark ; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.*

The emphatic mention of Noah's righteousness is evidently meant to convey the impression that there was no other exception to the corruption of the human race, and that he and his family possessed all the virtue that was left on the earth : they, therefore, were to enter the ark that they might be preserved, amid the universal destruction.

V. 2-3. *Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee seven and seven, the male and his female ; and of the beasts that are not clean, two and two,* the male and his female ; of the fowl also of the air, seven and seven, male and female : to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.*

It should be noticed that the command given, as we have supposed, fifty years before, spoke only of "two" of every sort. (Chapter vi. verse 19.) But in the meantime Noah had made a large collection of

* The Samaritan, Septuagint, and Vulgate versions agree in reading "two and two," instead of "two" as given in the Hebrew text ; and this is probably right ; as, otherwise, the continuance of the species would have depended on a single life.

pairs of animals, and some of these would have multiplied under his care, so that it was possible to enlarge in some cases the number of those who were to be preserved. This increase was to apply to the "clean" beasts, and no doubt also to the "clean" fowl. We learn, therefore, from this that the difference between "clean" and "unclean" animals and birds had already become recognised. Whether the distinctions were the same as those laid down long after in the Mosaic law, we have no means of judging, but probably they were less elaborate. It is not difficult to see how such a distinction would arise. As soon as men began to eat flesh there would be certain kinds of flesh which they would choose, and others which they would instinctively refuse. Naturally those creatures which they did not like to eat themselves, they would not think it right to offer in sacrifice to God. Hence, there would almost inevitably arise a ritual distinction, making the difference between clean and unclean fixed and permanent. But it is perhaps more probable that the process would be just the reverse of this; that when Adam and his sons began to make offerings to God, some indication would be given to them of what would and what would not be acceptable to Him; and then, when men began to eat flesh, they would naturally shrink from that which they might not offer to God.

V. 4. *For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and every living thing that I have made will I blot out from off the face of the ground.*

A week was given for the embarkation of all that was to be brought into the ark. We may feel sure that Noah, being aware that the whole future of the world depended upon him, would be careful to bring into the ark, in addition to the animals which he was expressly directed to take with him, whatever could be carried that was valuable in the civilisation of the world which was about to perish. For instance, we

may feel confident that he would make a selection of all seeds of the cereals, useful trees, and even of such flowers as had been cultivated for beauty. So, again, he would be anxious to preserve as far as possible, all useful contrivances and inventions that had been devised in the progress of civilization. Probably he would have had his sons carefully instructed in all handicrafts, and in all the art, science and knowledge generally, that then existed. But he would be especially careful to preserve all those records of the previous history of the race and of God's dealings with them, narrated in the first six chapters of the Book of Genesis.

V. 5. *And Noah did according to all (Jehovah) commanded him.*

That is to say, the week was actually spent in doing all that he had been directed to do, and it was done completely.

V. 6. *And Noah was a son of six hundred years when the flood came, waters upon the land.*

We have had this expression, "Noah was the son of so many years," before, in the last verse of the fifth chapter.* A hundred years of additional experience—years of peculiar trial and interest calculated to mature such a man—had since passed over Noah, and now he was completely fitted to be the second father of the human race.

V. 7. *And Noah went in and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the ark, because of the waters of the Flood.*

The way in which the enumeration of the persons who entered the ark is repeated, is evidently intended to emphasize the fact that none other but they were permitted to avail themselves of this means of escape. Contrary to what we might have expected, neither friends, kinsmen, nor dependants were invited or permitted to share their security. Almost equally

* See p. 149.

emphatic is the repeated enumeration of the remnant of animals which they took with them.

V. 8-9. *Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of everything that creepeth upon the ground, there went in two and two, unto Noah, into the ark, male and female, as God commanded Noah.*

There was no driving in of a promiscuous crowd of beasts; all that had been commanded to be taken, they, and they alone, were led in in separate pairs; and Noah, within the ark, allotted to them their appointed places.

V. 10. *And it came to pass after the seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the land.*

The occurrence of the period of seven days several times in the course of the narrative of the Flood, seems to make it certain that the institution of a week consisting of six days and a Sabbath, which we have seen was established from the very first,* was still kept up in Noah's time; probably by the world generally, and almost certainly, at any rate, in the families of the patriarchs. Without by any means asserting that this was what actually occurred, we may suppose that the command to commence the embarkation was given to Noah on the Sabbath day; that he and all his family were then engaged all the week in carrying out the direction, and that they finished the work before sunset on Friday afternoon, when the next Sabbath would begin: so that the first day spent in the ark would be the Sabbath day.

V. 11. *In the year of six hundred years of the life of Noah, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on the same day, were all the sources of great surging waters burst asunder, and the flood-gates of heaven were opened.*

The designation of time is remarkable. The meaning is apparently that Noah completed his six hundredth year some time in the year, according to the

* See Part I., pp. 63, 64.

reckoning of those days, in the second month of which the Flood commenced. It might thus happen that his six hundredth birthday came in the first or second month of that year, before the Flood began ; or it might happen that his six hundredth year was completed in one of the later months of that year, after the flood came.* It becomes apparent as we go on with the narrative, that a year was then in use, consisting of twelve months of thirty days each, with an intercalation, no doubt, either of five days annually, or perhaps, more probably, of an entire month of thirty days every sixth year. It is also worth noticing that the Septuagint and the Samaritan versions give the date of the beginning of the Flood as the twenty-seventh day of the second month, instead of the seventeenth, while the Vulgate agrees with the Hebrew. In the fourteenth verse of the eighth chapter all four versions agree in reading *in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the land dry*. According then to the Greek and the Samaritan, the catastrophe occupied just a year : and it is difficult to say whether the disturbance actually lasted just a year, which would be a scientific fact of some importance, or whether the real date was slightly altered in order to give the idea that the time was just a year. It will be found by adding together the intervals between the births of the successive patriarchs till Noah, and including, besides, the six hundred years of Noah's life, that we get A.M., 2,262 for the date of the Flood.†

On the same day were all the sources of great surging waters burst asunder.

It is not easy to understand what was the exact idea in the writer's mind. No doubt, he himself saw from the safe vantage ground of the ark, the

* It is clear from verse 6, that the former alternative is the true one.

† See Appendix F, p. 224.

great waters come rolling over the land tumultuously, and, in accordance with the notions prevalent at that time, he assigns as the cause of this, a disturbance at the bottom of the ocean. Apparently it was supposed that beneath the visible sea there was an immense reservoir of water, which welled up in certain places in sufficient quantity to supply the waste occasioned by evaporation ; but that at this crisis, this stored-up ocean burst through the covering which ordinarily held it in, and poured forth in surging masses, which raised the sea greatly above its usual level* and caused it to overwhelm the land.

And the flood-gates of heaven were opened.

Here, again, the fact witnessed is accounted for by a theory. What the writer actually saw was rain pouring down in cataracts ; and he explains this by the supposition that an ocean of water contained in or above the clouds, instead of being let out gradually, so as to descend in ordinary rain, escaped through openings which were usually closed, and thus fell in immense masses.†

It is worthy of notice that when the Almighty Himself speaks, no countenance is given to any such physical theories. Thus in verse 17, it is simply, *I do bring the flood of waters upon the land*. Again, in the fourth verse of the seventh chapter, *I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights* ; but, as before, no explanation is given.

V. 12. *And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.*

Let us consider for a moment what must have been the condition of things upon the earth during the

* It is not improbable, however, that the writer used this strong language to describe the stupendous phenomenon which he witnessed, without having any theory on the subject.

† All this, however, is very doubtful : it is not unlikely that the writer merely employs strong figurative language to describe the overwhelming downpour. Compare II. Kings, vii. 2.

time that the catastrophe lasted, in order to produce this result. There must have been brilliant sunshine on the great oceans, causing immense evaporation ; and there must have been strong winds blowing from every quarter, driving the vapour thus produced over the land upon which the rain was to fall. There it must have been condensed into thick layers of black clouds, which discharged themselves in floods of rain on the devoted countries. Each set of clouds as it vanished by exhausting itself in this tremendous downpour, must have been replaced continually by fresh clouds, and this process must have gone on for forty entire days. We cannot say positively that this could not be the case over all the land on the surface of the globe, but it seems more probable that it could only have occurred in an area large, it may be, but still limited. It may be remarked here, that the Hebrew does not by any means necessarily convey the impression which the English versions give to the reader, that the catastrophe affected the whole globe. The Hebrew word, *aretz*, which is translated in those versions throughout this narrative “ the earth,” is used sometimes to denote the whole globe ; but not infrequently it means “ land ” as opposed to “ sea,” and also “ a land ” or “ particular country.” The only other expression which might raise a doubt occurs in the vi. chapter, verse 17, where the Almighty says that He will *destroy all flesh “ from under heaven.”* But if we refer to Deuteronomy ii. 25, we read, *This day will I begin to put the dread of thee and the fear of thee upon the peoples that are “ under the whole heaven ”* ; where it is clear that the peoples referred to can only be those of the surrounding nations. Thus, we see that the phrase, *under heaven* may be applied to what exists under the sky in a particular area.*

* The late Dr. Pusey was too good a Hebrew scholar not to perceive that the words used in the Hebrew text to describe the deluge did not necessarily imply that the

V. 13. *By the selfsame day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark ;*

The English versions have “ *in* ” *the self-same day* ; but it is most improbable that, having a whole week given to them to get everything ready, Noah and his family would put off driving all the beasts into the ark and settling themselves in it, till the very day on which the Flood was to begin. The fact is, that the Hebrew word, “ *b-*,” which commonly means “ *in*,” is used also to denote that an action goes on up to the very time or space marked off or indicated. It is even used sometimes when the action takes place immediately *after* the time mentioned.* We may suppose that the work of preparation was carried on close up to sunset on the Friday, when the Sabbath would begin ; and that then the inmates of the ark waited in anxious expectation until the fearful down-pour began on Saturday evening after the Sabbath was over.

V. 14. *They and every beast after its kind, and the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and every fowl after its kind, every little bird of every wing.*

In this final enumeration of the animals taken into the ark, *every beast* means the wild beasts ; *the cattle* includes, not only sheep and goats, but also beasts of burden, asses, and probably camels ; *every creeping thing* denotes all the smaller quadrupeds, such as whole globe was submerged. He says (Pusey's Daniel, Preface, 2nd Edition, top of page xxii.), “ It is obviously matter of faith that the whole race of mankind perished, except those who, obeying God, took refuge in the ark. As for other questions, whether only the known world, inhabited by man (according to the analogy of ἡ οἰκουμένη—all the world—in the New Testament) or whether our whole planet was submerged, is, I believe, not defined by Holy Scripture.”

* See Appendix C, Part I, pp. 137, 138.

hares * ; *every fowl* would mean the birds generally ; and then, in order to show that the smaller birds were not forgotten, there is added, *every little bird of every wing*.

V. 15-16. *And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is the breath of life. And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh as God commanded him.*

The point of this final enumeration is that God's commands were exactly fulfilled, and that *by the self-same day, i.e.*, the very day on which the catastrophe commenced, all these were safely housed in the ark.

And (Jehovah) shut him in.

As they had entered by God's command, they were fenced in from every danger by God's protection, as by the strongly-barred gates of a fortified city.

It may be convenient at this point to consider what accommodation was afforded for the inmates of the ark, and what arrangements were made for their well-being.

We have seen that there is good reason to suppose that the family of Noah, and the animals they took with them, were domiciled on the second or middle deck, and that that deck was probably 525 feet long, and 88 feet wide.† The depth of the ark was 52 feet ; so that allowing 12 feet for the thickness of the floors, and for spaces between the third deck and the bottom of the vessel and above the upper deck, we have 20 feet left for the space between the upper and middle decks, and 20 feet between the middle and third decks. We may suppose one end of the middle deck to have been partitioned off for the use of Noah and his family. As the breadth was 88 feet, it will be found that 25 feet taken off from the length would give

* Perhaps the technical term "vermin" most nearly corresponds to the Hebrew word.

† See p. 168.

ample accommodation for eight people.* This leaves five hundred feet of length for the arrangement of the animals.† Now the great lion house at the Regent's Park Zoological Gardens, contains fourteen dens, of which six are eighteen feet long, and eight about nine feet, making a total frontage of 180 feet. It will be found that 35 such dens placed lengthways—viz., 15 of the larger, and 20 of the smaller—could be contained in the 500 feet of deck; leaving 50 feet over for passages at the two ends, and at different points between the dens. The depth of the dens in the Regent's Park is 12 feet; so that the breadth of the deck of the ark being 88 feet, there would be room for six parallel lines of thirty-five dens each, viz., two rows placed against the opposite sides of the ark, and four intermediate, with passage room of three feet between each row and the next. This would give a total of 210 dens, ninety of eighteen feet long, and one hundred and twenty of nine feet, affording accommodation for 210 distinct sets of animals. Of course, a number of the smaller animals could be kept in cages or in dens of a much less size, but on the other hand, the larger clean animals, such as the fourteen deer, and the fourteen bulls and cows, would require a much larger enclosure: so that on the whole the number of dens mentioned may be considered sufficiently accurate for our purpose. Assuming, then, that the ark was arranged to hold 210 different species of animals, let us compare this with the number contained in the Zoological Gardens. In 1896, when the last catalogue was published, there were there 3044 different species of vertebrate animals; but of

* Naturally the window that would open, mentioned in the 8th chapter, 6th verse, would be in this part of the vessel.

† I am indebted for the particulars which follow with regard to the arrangements for the animals at the Regent's Park Zoological Gardens, to the courtesy of Mr. Thomson, the head keeper.

these about 600 were reptiles and fishes, which would not be taken in the ark. Reckoning only the mammals and birds, there were 2,446 species, being more than ten times as many as we have supposed to have been provided for in the ark. It will be seen at once that if we consider the Flood to have been universal, a great number of the species which now exist must have been destroyed ; so that we seem here to have a strong proof that the catastrophe extended over a limited, though probably very large area. The only way of escaping from this conclusion appears to lie in the supposition that at particular times and under very special circumstances the development of new species from those previously existing may have proceeded with far greater rapidity than Darwin supposed : in which case it would not be impossible that all the species now existing might have descended from the animals contained in the ark. We imagine it is now generally allowed that not even the slightest step towards the establishment of a new distinct species has ever been taken within the time when biological facts have been scientifically observed and recorded. No doubt, endless varieties have been produced, but either they have been sterile, or else they have always tended to revert to the normal form of the species in which they occurred, and could only be prevented from doing so by constant human intervention. Hence, it is clear that if new species ever did originate from those previously existing, this must have occurred at times and under circumstances of which we have no record ; and there is nothing to show how many or how few generations were sufficient to carry out the process in any particular instance. It is therefore we think impossible, scientifically, to deny that all the animals which we now have, *may* have sprung from those taken in the ark, by developments which occurred in unascertained places, and unrecorded ages, between the period of the Flood and that of modern scientific observation. Still, it may

be allowed that such a supposition is not very probable, and, therefore, taken with other considerations, the limited number of animals that could have been carried in the ark does render it likely that the catastrophe only effected a limited area, within which those animals were found, and by the submergence of which they would otherwise have been exterminated. As to the extent of that area, geological investigations seem to show that it must have reached on the West, through the centre of Europe, to the Atlantic Ocean, but we seem to have nothing at present to indicate the limits to which it stretched on the East, though we should be inclined to surmise that it extended at least as far as India.

As to the exact nature of the catastrophe, although there can be no doubt that a universal deluge might be caused by a contraction of the entire crust of the earth, or, again, by the levelling-up of the great ocean depths, yet we have seen reason for supposing that such a universal submergence of the globe was not likely to have occurred. The more probable supposition is, that there was a subsidence of the land over a large, though at present undefined, area—of which the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and the countries adjacent to them, was the centre—allowing the sea to break through its accustomed limits, and to cover the land to the depth of at least 2,000 feet. Since the currents drifted the ark, as we shall see, towards the mountainous country of Armenia, it seems probable that the greatest depression was in that neighbourhood ; and as there is evidence to show that in Western Europe it amounted to about 2,000 feet, we may assume, with some degree of certainty, that in the centre of the disturbance it was much greater.*

* It is very desirable that careful geological researches should be made in Mesopotamia, and the adjacent countries, to ascertain this, and several other points of interest. We may picture to ourselves the depression as a huge bowl or pan, with shelving sides, sloping down gradually towards the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. Such a

V. 17. *And the Flood was forty days upon the earth.*

We shall find as we go on, that the Flood was at its highest point for a much longer period than forty days : we must understand, therefore, that forty days indicates the time during which the water continued rising.

And the waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth.

Judging from the quantity of rain which often descends in sheets in the tropics, it would not be at all an extravagant supposition that at least a foot-and-a-half depth of fresh rain water may have descended in every twenty-four hours while the catastrophe lasted.* As the water would be much lighter than the sea water which was flowing in, it would remain on the surface ; so that since the downpour lasted forty days, there would at the end of that time be no less than 60 feet of fresh water enveloping the surface of the ocean within the limits of depression. The consequences of this would be, first of all, that the fresh-water fish could be preserved alive through the catastrophe ; and secondly, that Noah and his family and the animals with them in the ark would have an abundant supply of water for drinking and for other purposes.

With wondering eyes, and probably with much derisive ridicule, but perhaps, too, with deep misgivings and many strange forebodings, the people who dwelt around subsidence would not be sufficient to cause the submergence of the peaks of the high mountains, such as Ararat, or of the ranges extending thence towards the west, but it would completely cover all the lower ranges, and especially the mountainous plateaux of the Zagros mountains—extending from the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf to Armenia—which are about 2,000 feet high.

* Probably this quantity is greatly below the mark. Mr. Scott, the secretary of the Meteorological Council, informs me that considerably more than 36 inches of rain have been known to fall in 24 hours. It is not unlikely, then, that the depth of fresh water at the end of 40 days may have been 120 feet.

must have watched the bringing of the animals, pair after pair, into the ark, and all the other preparations which were going on during the previous week. At last, at nightfall of the seventh day, having seen Noah and his family safely housed in the ark, they may have gone home wondering and anxious. Bye-and-bye the heavens became overcast with dense black clouds, and torrents of water began to pour down with such violence and in such quantities that all the ordinary means of carrying off rain, and even of protection against it, must have proved unavailing. And in the midst of the excitement and consternation that must have immediately prevailed, suddenly the awful cry was heard that the sea was breaking in upon them. If any lived near enough, and were undistracted enough to do so, they may have watched the ark—that curious structure with which they had been so long familiar, and which probably had been the subject of many a jest as being an eccentric man’s foolish hobby—rising slowly from the ground, and bearing its living freight safely into the tumult of waters.

V. 18. *And the waters prevailed, and increased greatly upon the land ; and the ark went upon the face of the waters.*

The word *went*, implies that there was no violence in the motion of the ark. We may easily understand that the first in-rush of the sea would be with much agitation. But until the water had risen to the height of nearly 15 cubits, or 26 feet, the ark with its heavy load would remain immovably fixed on the ground. By the time when it began to rise, the incursion of the water would have become a regular and equable flow, driving the ark in one particular direction, but not occasioning any serious disturbance of its equilibrium. Thus, while all the rest of the world was in the direst confusion and dismay, the inmates of the ark would be carried safely and calmly on their appointed way, amid the most appalling sounds, yet feeling thankful that

they themselves were passing free from harm through the ruin of a world.

V. 19. *And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the land ; and all the high mountain ranges that were under the whole heaven were covered.*

We feel that we have here the testimony of an eye-witness describing what he himself saw. For some days, probably the darkness of the night in which we have supposed the Flood to have begun, did not pass away, owing to the dense mass of cloud necessary for the production of such a tremendous rainfall. But towards the end of the forty days during which the cataclysm lasted, probably the rain gradually lessened, and the clouds thinned sufficiently to allow of Noah looking as far as the horizon. He could see the tops of high mountain ranges still visible above the water, and he could note how these disappeared one by one, till at last there remained only the lofty table-land, towards which his vessel was drifting, At length, as he approached it, that also was covered, and the ark passed over the high plateau which had been dry land a few days before. Thus as far as he could discern, *all the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered.*

V. 20. *Fifteen cubits upwards did the waters prevail ; and the mountains were covered.*

The ark was thirty cubits high, and Noah knew how much of it was sunk below the water : this would probably be about half its depth, namely, 15 cubits, or nearly 26 feet. He would know, therefore, that there must be at least that depth of water—in other words, that the waters prevailed fifteen cubits, measuring down from above.

V. 21-22. *And all flesh expired that moved upon the earth, of fowls, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every crawling thing that crawleth upon the earth, and every man : all in whose nostrils was the breath of the life-spirit, of all that was in the dry land, died ; i.e., every living thing within the submerged area.*

It will be noticed that the two last kinds of living things, namely, *every crawling thing* and *every man*, are marked off from the rest by the word *every*. Probably this was done to denote the universality of the destruction, ranging from the lowest insect to man.

V. 23. *And every living thing was blotted out which was upon the face of the ground, from man to beast, to creepeth thing, and to fowl of the heaven ; and they were blotted out from the earth : and there was left only Noah, and they that were with him in the ark.*

Probably this awful destruction was accomplished in a comparatively short time. The pitchy darkness, the tremendous rain soon causing all streams to swell, thus breaking down and destroying the bridges and other means of communication, and the rapid rise of the water, which must have amounted on the average to fifty feet in the twenty-four hours,* must have paralyzed every effort to escape. Ships at sea, being, as they always were in ancient times, very near the coast, would be carried by the in-rushing flood on to the land, and so dashed to pieces ; while smaller vessels and boats on the rivers and canals would be swamped by the prodigious downpour, and whirled to destruction by the rush of waters. Perhaps a few dwellers upon the sides, or the tops of the mountains, may have survived for a short time, only to perish miserably by starvation, as the rain and rising water cut them off from all supplies ; but probably, with the exception of these, the rest of mankind perished in the first twenty-four hours.

We think that there is reason to suppose that the number of human beings who were destroyed in this frightful catastrophe could not have been less than

* As the geological evidence goes to show that the height of the Flood must have been over two thousand feet, even at the part of least depression, and the cataclysm lasted for forty days, the average rise of the water would be fifty feet a day ; so that everything living may have been engulfed within a few hours.

200,000,000, occupying an oval area extending from a little to the north-west of Scotland to a little to the south-west of the most southern point in India, and in breadth from the sea of Aral to the Nile.*

What, it may be asked, became of the angels who had settled on earth? Did their supernatural powers enable them to escape the overwhelming waters? or, rather, did not their connection with the mortal women make them also subject to the conditions of mortality? We have no means of answering these questions, but we do know what fate overtook them as the just punishment of that faithless self-indulgence which caused the wrecking of a world. The angels who sinned with Satan are yet allowed freedom to wander over the earth, and even to appear in the courts of heaven,† but these other apostates have no such liberty; they are *kept in everlasting bonds, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.*‡

V. 24. *And the waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days.*

The actual cataclysm of the rain pouring down from heaven and of the water rushing in from the sea, occupied forty days, so that there were 110 days during which the Flood maintained its highest level. In that time, all vegetable life within the region of the subsidence which could not sustain long submergence, must have perished; and it would be a curious subject of scientific investigation to discover what kind of trees, shrubs, plants, herbs and weeds, either in the seed or in the mature state, could survive such a bath. All that was most valuable in the vegetable productions of those regions we may be sure that Noah would take with him in the ark; and on the other hand, many a

* See Appendix F, p. 224.

† See Job i. 6-7, and Eph. vi. 12.

‡ Jude v. 6. Compare also II. Peter, ii. 4-5.

useless plant or noxious weed may have been exterminated for ever. Thus, the Flood may have been, among other things, a laver of regeneration to all that part of the earth which it affected, destroying many injurious beasts and plants, and giving freshness and vigour to the soil, which had long been languishing under the primeval curse.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SUBSIDENCE OF THE FLOOD, AND GOD'S RENEWED BLESSING OF THE EARTH AND ITS INHABITANTS.

V. 1. *And God remembered Noah, and every living thing and all the cattle that were with him in the ark ;*

For 110 days as we have seen, there was apparently no visible change ; below, a dull, motionless waste of waters, on which the ark lay like a log ; above, a dull, sunless sky, without a breath of wind to cause a ripple on the sea or a breeze in the air. This state of things must have lasted for more than three months, and the hearts of those who were confined in the ark would sink within them, as they began to wonder whether it would ever end, and it seemed as if He Who had brought them into that position had ceased to care for them. One thing, no doubt, had helped them to endure the dullness of that cheerless time of waiting—the having to attend to the wants of the helpless creatures committed to their care. Probably Noah and his wife would only take the general superintendence, but there would be six other persons to carry out their directions. There would be every day an immense quantity of work to be done in feeding the animals, cleaning out their cells, and keeping them in health by trying to amuse them, and ministering to their comfort generally. Naturally the three sons of Noah would take charge of all the larger and fiercer animals, but there would be plenty for their wives to do in ministering to the birds and smaller creatures.* Thus, there was sufficient occupation to relieve a monotony and confinement which might otherwise have been almost intolerable. But the time of waiting at length came to an end ;

* See Appendix G, p. 227.

*And God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged ; **

and Noah became aware that the Flood was diminishing.

V. 2. and the sources of surging waters and the flood-gates of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was kept shut up.

Noah would be able to perceive that the water was flowing away from the heights above which the ark lay ; and from this he would naturally conclude that the disturbance at the bottom of the ocean, which he had supposed to have caused the eruption of the sea, had come to an end, and that the waters were returning to the subterranean reservoir from which they had issued.

V. 3. And the waters returned from over the land, and went on returning ; and after the end of one hundred and fifty days the waters decreased.†

* These words imply that since the cessation of the rain there had been a perfect calm on the waters, and probably also sufficient cloud to prevent any evaporation arising from the heat of the sun. Now, however, the sun shone forth in its might, and a hot wind began to blow over the face of the water, causing abundant vapour to rise with a gradual lowering of the surface.

† The immense torrents of rain which poured down during forty days, while the Flood was rising, and the strong currents of water which must have been running off from the higher ground during the five months of its subsidence, must have greatly altered the contour of the earth's surface in that part over which the Deluge extended. There would be great denudation, tending to the levelling of elevations, and the cutting out of valleys, or the deepening of those already existing. Thus it would happen that water-courses and the channels of rivers might be scooped out in a few months to lower levels, which the ordinary action of water would take hundreds of years in causing them to reach. It is much to be desired that scientific geologists who have sufficient faith in the record of Genesis to admit that the account of the Deluge there given may possibly be true, would carefully investigate the effect of such a catastrophe in producing the results which we have named.

As nothing was visible but the vast surface of water, Noah, at first, could only conjecture that the water was decreasing from observing that it was flowing away from the mountain range over which the current had originally drifted the ark ; and he noticed that the reversed current began to flow just 150 days after the Flood had commenced, which would be on the seventeenth day of the seventh month of the year, as then reckoned. But in a short time his conjecture was proved to be the fact ;

V. 4. *And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the twenty-seventh* day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.*

It is a matter of some interest to determine as nearly as we can the place at which the ark rested after its eventful voyage. We must notice first of all that Ararat always denotes in the Bible, a country, not a mountain. That country corresponds pretty nearly with the district to the south-west of the Caspian Sea, and includes the northern part of the Zagros mountains, at some point in which the ark probably rested. To define the spot more closely, we may observe that it must have been out of sight of the high peaks of Mount Ararat, which could hardly have been covered by the waters of the flood, and yet could not be seen by the inmates of the ark. Moreover, the ark must have rested on a plateau on which it could lie securely, and there must have been easy descents from this table-land to the levels lying below. We have little doubt that a careful search in the northern part of the Zagros range would lead to the discovery of the most likely spot.† We must not expect to find the ark, or any portion of it still remaining. Probably the descendants of Noah lived and pastured their cattle for many years on the neighbouring table-lands, and the wood of the ark must have been far

* See Appendix H, p. 228.

† See Appendix K, p. 229.

too valuable for fuel, and for building purposes to be spared for any long time.

V. 5. *And the waters went on decreasing until the tenth month ; in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.*

As the ark rested upon the highest land within view, it must have been the table-land on which the ark itself lay that first came in sight. When the waters began to recede, the ark must have been floating in at least thirty feet of water, so that the flood must have lessened thirty feet between the seventeenth day of the seventeenth month, and the first day of the tenth. Taking the month to consist of thirty days, this gives seventy-three days for the waters to sink thirty feet. Had the decrease gone on only at that rate it would have taken several years for the ocean to return to its usual level. But when the subsidence of the earth which had caused the catastrophe ceased after forty days, and then the absolute quietude of 110 days had come to an end and the land began to rise again, the elevation would naturally commence at first slowly, and become more and more rapid up to a certain point, after which it would slacken till it ceased. Thus the rate at starting gives us no indication of the time that the recession of the waters would last.

V. 6. *And it came to pass at the end of forty days, that Noah opened the ark's window which he had made.**

Evidently Noah waited till a large extent of land could be seen free from water, and then he tried an expedient to discover how much land was left bare beyond the limit which his eye could reach.

V. 7. *and he sent forth the raven,*

The article here denotes an individual of the species ; just as a person might say, who wanted to be better

* The words "which he had made," no doubt refer to the window, which had not been mentioned before ; so that they are really equivalent to "the window which he had made in the ark."

acquainted with the lion tribe, “ I will go and see what the lion is like.”

and it went forth to go out and to come back, until the waters were dried up from off the earth.

The raven would find plenty of garbage for his food ; but as yet there were no living trees above the surface of the water, and the ground was still saturated. Hence, though not offering to enter the ark again, he would come back to rest and roost upon it.

V. 8. *And he sent forth from him the dove, to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground ;*

Not having learnt much from the raven, Noah probably waited for a week, and then sent forth a dove to see what information she might bring back ;

V. 9. *but the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him to the ark,*

There was still no tree on which she could light, or only a few shrivelled and decaying branches, and the ground had been left sodden and muddy by the receding waters. So the dove found that she could not rest comfortably anywhere, and after awhile returned ;

for the waters were on the face of the whole land :

and therefore in her case, no suitable food could be found, and after a time she came back and fluttered at the window of the ark ;

and he put forth his hand and took her, and brought her in unto him into the ark.

V. 10-11. *And he stayed yet seven days more, and again he sent the dove from the ark : and the dove came in to him at eventide ; and lo, an olive leaf newly plucked in her mouth :*

This showed that the waters had sunk below the level at which the olive-tree grows ; and there is evidence to prove that it will flourish under water.

so Noah knew that the waters were abated from off the land.

How far could Noah infer that the waters had receded ? The olive tree flourishes in the east at the height of three thousand feet above the level of the

sea ; so that there might be olive-trees growing pretty nearly at the greatest altitude that the Flood reached. If so, their submersion would be in fresh water, as we have seen that there must probably have been a layer of such water, of considerable thickness, lying upon the water which flowed in from the sea.* It is far more probable that the olive would be able to survive under fresh water at that elevation for about four months—which would be all the time required, than under salt water. Hence, it would appear that all that Noah could learn from the return of the dove with the fresh olive leaf was, that the water had abated to some distance below the level which he could survey from the window of the ark.

V. 12. *And he stayed seven days more, and sent forth the dove ; and she did not continue to return to him again.*

The mention in this narrative of the interval of seven days shows that the observance of the Sabbath, instituted at the beginning, had not been lost in Noah's family. As the direct descendant of Adam, separated from him by only one person, Mahalalel—who was contemporaneous with Adam for 135 years, and with Noah for twenty-eight years—the latter must have been the depository of all the sacred institutions and records that had come down from the very beginning.†

V. 13. *And it came to pass in the six hundred and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried from off the earth :‡*

* See p. 187.

† See pp. 151, 152.

‡ It is almost certain that the water did not sink, or to speak more correctly, the ground did not rise, to its former level, but a considerable district of what had been dry land became permanently a part of the Persian Gulf. To some distance beyond the site of Babylon, alluvial soil exists, in which are found shells belonging to the same species as still live in the Gulf. Thus the site of Paradise and the original abode of the human race must, for many centuries after the Flood, have been sunk below the sea ; but the gradual rising of the land, through the deposit

As far as could be seen from the “light,” and the window, which Noah had made in the ark, no water was visible ; but probably it was not possible to see therefrom what was the condition of the lower ground.

and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and, behold, the face of the ground was dried.

As we have seen already,* the upper deck of the ark must have been entirely covered with something of the nature of a tarpaulin, or tent-like enclosure made of skins. By removing this covering, Noah would be able to look down from the deck on the country lying below the mountainous region on which the ark was resting ; and thus he could see that the land was no longer covered with water.

V. 14. *And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried up.*

The catastrophe commenced on the seventeenth day of the second month in the previous year, so that from its beginning to the entire removal of its consequences, so far as they were removed, a year passed and ten days. Probably the recession of the water commenced on the seventeenth day of the seventh month ; consequently, the whole time during which the waters were returning to a permanent level was exactly five months.

When Noah looked on the world outspread before him on the first day of the year, he could discern that though no water was visible, the ground was still humid and steaming with damp ; therefore he waited for fifty-seven days, till he saw that all superfluous moisture was dried up.

V. 15-16. *And God spake unto Noah saying : Go forth of the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee.*

This careful enumeration of the persons who were incessantly carried down by the two great rivers, has probably brought the head of the Persian Gulf to nearly the same position which it occupied in the time of Adam.

* See pp. 169, 170.

to leave the ark, seems expressly intended to preclude the possible idea that anyone had died, or that any child had been born, during the year that the family had been shut up in the ark.

V. 17. *Every living thing that is with thee of all flesh, of fowl, and of cattle, and of every creeping thing that creepeth on the earth, bring forth with thee ; that they may breed abundantly in the earth and be fruitful, and multiply upon the earth.*

Here, again, the minute enumeration seems intended to show that nothing had been lost, and that nothing was to be left behind uncared for.

V. 18-19. *And Noah went forth and his sons, and his wife and his sons' wives with him : every living thing, all the creeping things, and all the fowl, all that moveth over the earth, after their families, went forth from the ark.*

The first feeling of all these creatures, and especially of Noah and his family, must have been one of delight in their regained liberty, and of intense gratitude for their miraculous deliverance : and in the case of one so devout as Noah, that delight and gratitude would be sure to express itself first in an act of worship.

V. 20. *And Noah builded an altar unto (Jehovah) ; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered whole burnt offerings on the altar.*

Under the Mosaic law not every kind of clean beast was to be offered unto the Lord. In the first chapter of Leviticus, the second verse, it is expressly said, *When any man of you offereth an oblation unto the Lord, ye shall offer the oblation of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock.* Hence no one could have composed the passage we are now considering after the Mosaic legislation had been given ; 'and we have one more proof of the extremely ancient origin of the Book of Genesis. No doubt the various animals had multiplied during their year's sojourn in the ark, so that one could be taken from each kind of clean beast to sacrifice to the Lord, without lessening the original

number. Noah, as the High Priest of regenerated earth, offers as it were the first-fruits to God, as a token that all belongs to Him. And it is most significant that the first outburst of joy and gratitude involves in its expression suffering and death. To man, thus making a fresh start in his career, it was signified that his progress would involve, if it were to be an upward progress, self-sacrifice, often to the extent of suffering and death. And if any ask why should the innocent creatures be slaughtered to show forth this, the answer is, that whatever living thing suffers in the service of God, is ennobled by that suffering, and will be abundantly rewarded. And just because God foresees and purposes this result, the record goes on to tell us :—

V. 21. *And (Jehovah) smelled the sweet savour ;*

We need not be afraid to take these words with strict literalness. Man is made in the image of God, and as it is written, *He that hath made the ear shall He not hear ?* so it may be asked, He that made the nostrils, shall He not smell ? But, of course, the appreciation of a delicious odour is mentioned as the indication of far higher delight. In that sacrifice the whole sentient earth was, for a time at any rate, offering itself up to God to be dealt with according to His wise and loving will ; and for a time at any rate, the Lord could rejoice in the devotion of all His creatures. And that devotion brought down, as it ever does, an abundant reward : for the verse goes on—

and (Jehovah) said to his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake ;

We are in the habit of thinking of God's designs as settled from all eternity, and admitting of no variation ; but we can hardly assert that we have got that idea from the Holy Scriptures. No doubt the grand outlines of God's purposes are laid down inflexibly, and finally carried out through all obstacles and in spite of all apparent interruptions. But the minor details must vary with the varied decisions of

man's free-will, so that again and again God says to himself, "I will do," or "I will not do," "this or that."

The Deluge of salt water lasting for nearly a year, had eradicated all weeds and noxious plants in the space over which the Flood prevailed, and thus the primeval curse was for a time taken off; and now God promises,—for that which He had said to His heart, He must have made known to Noah—that He will not bring that curse back. Probably the climate, as well as the soil, had been changed by the cataclysm, so as to be less favourable to the growth of what was useless or injurious.

But God assigns a very remarkable reason for not renewing the curse :

for that the imagination of man's heart is evil from his childhood :

Even in the joy of accepting that first act of devotion, the Omniscient could not fail to discern the tendencies to evil that lurked in the hearts of the human beings who knelt before Him. When tried, the chastisement of excessive toil had done little to counteract the innate mischief; in spite of the earth being cursed for man's sake, *all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth*. Therefore, the Lord would now adopt a course of less severity, and give man more ease and leisure if haply he might employ it in seeking after God.

But the gracious response to man's prayer did not stop with this indication of future long-suffering. The frightful catastrophe and disturbance of the usual course of nature, must have left in the minds of those who survived it a sense of insecurity, and an apprehension of future derangement.

Therefore the promise goes on—

Neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.

V. 22. *All the days of the earth, sowing and reaping,*

cold and heat, cutting off and plucking of fruit, (choreph) day and night shall not cease.*

Usually, the attempt has been made, not very successfully, to identify the terms here used with different seasons of the year. But we think it is clear that the promise is, that operations of husbandry, which had been rendered impossible, and ordinary natural conditions, which had been partially suspended, during the year of the Flood, should henceforth, as a general rule, go on without interruption. There could, of course, for some time past, have been no sowing, reaping, or ingathering of fruits; the universal prevalence of water below and dense cloud above, must have altered the conditions, and probably produced an abnormal uniformity of temperature, different from the ordinary alternations of cold and heat; and there had been, at any rate during a part of the time, such continuous darkness as rendered it impossible to distinguish between day and night. Noah and his family are now assured that such an interruption of the course of nature shall never occur again; so that they might follow the ordinary occupations of life without fear of any similar derangement breaking in upon them.

But it must not be supposed that the great catastrophe of the Deluge produced no permanent moral effect. It had most strikingly revealed God's intense abhorrence of evil, and given an assurance that he would not suffer the wickedness of men to go beyond a certain point. There remained, henceforth, in the heart of sinful man, a dread of judgment to come, which even the most callous and reckless evil-doers

* The Hebrew word "Choreph" is never used elsewhere except to denote a season of the year. But the derivation shows clearly that this is only a secondary sense of the word, and that it must have originally meant "plucking" or "gathering of fruit." This original signification is most suitable here; and we need not be surprised at finding it in a document so ancient as that which we are considering.

could not altogether eradicate. Men have done their utmost to destroy in themselves, or to forget, the belief in a righteous God Who taketh vengeance ; but ever there has remained a gnawing misgiving, and a vague intuitive apprehension of a reckoning to come, which has expressed itself in many a curious formula and strange rite of expiation.

Let as now endeavour to realise the position, and the first steps, of the eight persons who had become the sole possessors of the earth. Two facts must have determined their immediate course ; one was that the ark contained their store of provisions, supply of water, and all the instruments and appliances which they had saved from the wreck of a past civilisation. The other fact was that they were on the top of a barren and waterless table-land, where it was impossible that they could remain any length of time. This second fact would oblige them as soon as possible to seek a lower level, where they could find a generous soil, and a sufficient supply of running water ; while the first would impel them to make this place of settlement as near as possible to the ark, that they might return to it again and again, to take out what they wanted. Perhaps their first care would be to get rid of the superfluous animals, and this would not be quite such an easy matter as might at first sight appear. Probably the carnivorous beasts and birds would soon wander away and finding plenty of carrion to supply them with food, would not return ; but the herbivorous and fruit eating creatures may have found themselves unable to procure the means of subsistence in the area devastated by the Flood. We saw, indeed, that there were probably groves of olives which had escaped destruction, and there may have been other trees and fruits, and lowlier forms of herbage, which may have survived ; but we think that for some months the vegetable-eating animals must have remained dependent on man for their sustenance, and therefore, although free, must have returned again and again

asking for food. Under these circumstances it would be easy for man to retain in subjection all the creatures that would be serviceable to himself ; and at any rate from the time of the Flood he must have kept with him, and had under his control, all cattle great and small, all beasts useful for draught or carriage, all domestic animals, and all poultry and such other birds as are suited to be his companions.* Hence, if we hear of the introduction of any such animal into a particular country at a later time, it would only be because those who first peopled that country either found it inconvenient to take it with them in their migration thither, or else lost the species afterwards through want of care, or from the climate proving unsuitable to it. The need for food would make it the more necessary that the human survivors of the Flood should commence agricultural operations as soon as possible : and accordingly, we find later on (chapter ix. 20), that Noah himself superintended this part of the work, and kept it chiefly in his own hands, till a very late period of his life. We have supposed that all the useful seeds and plants, including of course the cereals and the fruit trees, had been preserved in the ark, and those would be sown and planted out as soon as possible. But probably for some months both man and beast would be dependent upon the stores contained in the ark, and would have to make journeys to it, from time to time, to carry down supplies. One of the sons would look after the cattle and beasts of burden ; and as we find in later times, one or more of their wives might attend to the sheep and other small cattle. Then there would soon come the necessity of constructing some kind of residence for themselves and enclosures for the cattle. We must remember that these rulers of the whole earth had at first no one but themselves to do anything for them, there were no servants, work-people,

* This would of course apply only to those animals which were found in the area over which the Flood prevailed.

artisans, or dependents of any kind ; whatever had to be done, must be done with their own hands. We have suggested before, that with a view to this contingency, Noah had had his children carefully instructed in all useful arts and crafts, as well as in all knowledge that man had then acquired. And if so, the arts of the carpenter, the mason, the smith, the potter, the weaver, and all other fundamental crafts must have been known, and very soon employed, by the children of Noah. Thus the present race of men started with all the necessary appliances of civilisation and comfort ; and this no doubt is the reason why there is no record of the discovery of any fundamental handicraft or process. If, therefore we add to this the fact that God had been revealing Himself to man for more than 2,000 years, that Noah and his family were the inheritors of all these divine communications, and had them finally stamped upon their minds by a stupendous display of God's wrath and righteous indignation, we see how little reason there is to suppose that the human race, such as we now find it, began its career as a horde of filthy, immoral, godless savages, or even as a tribe of rude and unlettered nomads. One circumstance seems sufficient to prove the unreasonableness of all such speculations. There is no record of a degraded people having raised itself to a higher level, except through the intervention of some superior race ; and where was that superior race to come from if all mankind started originally from the lowest level ? Whenever we find men below a certain point, it is wandering, or being driven away, from the centres of civilisation ; the loss of one appliance after another ; ignorance, free indulgence in evil habits ; and, above all, the not choosing to retain God in their knowledge, that has brought them to this miserable condition.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CHARTER OF MAN'S RENEWED EXISTENCE UPON EARTH. THE STUMBLING OF NOAH; THE CONDUCT OF HIS SONS, AND THE PREDICTION OF THEIR FUTURE DESTINY.

We have seen under what circumstances mankind recommenced their life upon earth. At their first starting, the gift of it was re-assured to them by God's express renewal of the primeval grant: that they might use the world and all that it contained, for their own purposes, without offence and without scruple.

V. 1-2. *And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth. And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air; in all wherewith the ground teemeth, and in all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered.*

So far there is no change from the original gift of dominion over the whole animal creation; unless it be that at the first the creatures were to regard man with confidence as well as reverence, but now fear and dread of the human race was to be their natural feeling. The next verse shows why this must necessarily be the case, for now comes a remarkable change in man's relation to the lower animals.

V. 3. *Every moving thing that liveth shall be for food for you; as the green herb have I given you all.*

Originally, every herb, vegetable, and fruit was granted to man for his sustenance; but no permission was given to him to eat flesh. We can hardly doubt indeed that the lawless race who brought down upon themselves the vengeance of Almighty God had freely indulged in the eating of animal food,—and that probably with accompanying circumstances of great cruelty—without waiting for His permission. But it

is not unlikely that, in the line of the first-born sons and their families, the eating only of vegetable food may have been scrupulously observed. Now however, a greater licence is granted by God Himself ; but at the same time a warning is given against needless cruelty.

V. 4. *But flesh with the soul thereof, the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.*

Here, as elsewhere in Holy Scripture, the soul, which always implies sensation, is assumed to be closely connected with the blood. Sensation depends upon the proper action of the brain, and that again depends upon the brain being properly supplied with blood ; so that ultimately sensation results from the healthy action of the blood. Sensation then was to be carefully destroyed, before any living thing was used for food.

From this the divine decree goes on to speak of another breach of God's law, which had been awfully common in antediluvian times.

V. 5. *And surely your blood of your souls will I require ; at the hand of every beast will I require it : and at the hand of man, his brother, will I require the soul of man.*

It is scarcely possible to escape the conclusion from these words, that some direct penalty for manslaughter, beyond what man inflicts, is demanded by God both from animals and men. We can indeed hardly suppose that either a man or beast is to be blamed for killing a man in self-defence. But wild beasts who take to eating men, as Rudyard Kipling testifies, become mangy and lose their teeth ; * which seems as clearly a divine judgment as are the haunting terrors which dog the footsteps of the murderer.

But in respect to man the decree of God is much more decisive.

V. 6. *Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.*

* See "The Jungle Book," p. 5., twelve lines from the bottom.

It is difficult to understand how Christian nations, believing the Bible to be the Word of God, can suppose themselves to be at liberty to set aside this express command, thinking that they can be more merciful than God Himself : but this is only one instance of what we may call the maltreatment which the earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis have received. To anyone who believes that Book to be an authentic record, this command of God must render it certain that it is good for the man-slayer himself, as well as the community to which he belongs, that he should pay the penalty of death.

And the reason given is very remarkable ;
for in the image of God made He man.

These words show first of all that the Fall did not obliterate, however much it may have obscured, the image of God in man ; and secondly, they seem to necessitate the belief that the body—which alone is destroyed by killing—in some sort reflects or sets forth that image.

V. 7. *And you, be ye fruitful, and multiply ; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein.*

After the strong declaration of vengeance against blood shedding, which tends to limit the multiplication of the human race, God reiterates His desire and decree, that no restriction shall be put upon its increase.

Then the Divine Charter goes on to reiterate and reinforce an assurance that was given immediately after mankind and all the living things came forth from the ark.

V. 8-10. *And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I am establishing my covenant with you, and with your seed after you ; and with every living creature that is with you ; the fowl, the cattle, and every beast of the earth with you ; from all that went out of the ark, to every beast of the earth.*

This covenant it will be noticed, is carefully meant not merely to apply to the animals which had been

preserved in the ark, but to extend from them, to every beast that existed, or should afterwards exist upon the earth.

V. 11. *And I have established my covenant with you ; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood ; neither shall there arise any more a flood to destroy the earth.*

We cannot but notice the extreme reiteration and emphasis with which this covenant, or solemn promise to man is introduced. We must try and place ourselves in the position of those to whom it was first given, in order to appreciate the necessity for it, and the great consolation which it afforded. The horrible wickedness which preceded the great catastrophe, the shocking scenes which they witnessed when that catastrophe commenced, the tremendous downpour of rain, beating for forty days on the ark, their utter inability to control or direct the course of the vessel, and the long weary waiting upon the waste of waters during the days in which God seemed to have forgotten them, must have produced an impression upon their minds, the force of which it is impossible to exaggerate. Now that it was over it must have seemed like a horrible dream, from which they had just awakened. But could they be sure it was a dream which would not come again? There must have remained a tremor and trepidation in their minds, of which we may form some idea from the feelings of those who have just passed through a tremendous and destructive earthquake. The sense of insecurity and of the instability of all things may last for the remainder of life; and even the passing through a severe railway accident, without any personal injury, may occasion a misgiving which cannot be shaken off. Therefore, God in His great mercy, wishing to relieve the tension of mind of Noah and his family, gives them an express and solemn engagement that He will not again bring upon the human race such a dreadful catastrophe;

and he appoints a sign which would continually remind them of this most solemn promise.

V. 12-13. *And God said, This is the covenant token which I am giving between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations ; I have given my bow in the cloud, and it has become a token of a covenant between me and the earth.**

V. 14-15. *And it has come to pass when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow is seen in the cloud, and I will remember my covenant which is between me and you and every living soul of all flesh ; and the waters shall no more become a Flood to destroy all flesh.*

It is commonly supposed and taught by theologians, that God's omniscience is such that He ever has perpetually present to His mind, all things that ever have been. Holy Scripture does not seem to countenance this idea. Omniscience, we think, can only mean that God can always instantly call to His mind anything which He wishes to remember or contemplate ; not that He is necessitated to be always contemplating whatever has been or is to be. We believe, then, that these words, *I will remember*, are to be taken literally, and that as man, when he looks upon the rainbow from below, is to feel confident of the security of which it is a pledge, so he may rightly think of God Himself as looking down upon it from above, and remembering His solemn promise.

V. 16-18. *And the bow has risen in the clouds ; and I have looked upon it, that I may remember the*

* It is not certain whether the words used imply that the rainbow was a new phenomenon now appearing for the first time, or whether God gave to the human race something which previously existed, to be a pledge of the fulfilment of His solemn promise. The expressions employed do not appear necessarily to mean more than the latter, but it is conceivable that the great cataclysm may have resulted in a change in the constitution of the atmosphere which produced this new phenomenon, so that there may have been then, as there will be at the last, new heavens as well as a renovated earth.

everlasting covenant between God and every living soul of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the covenant token which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth. And the sons of Noah, that went forth from the ark, consisted of Shem and Ham and Japheth : and Ham is the father of Canaan.

The Hebrew word “Canaan,” as applied to an infant, would mean “depressed,” so that this was probably a puny, fretful child from its birth. But why is he mentioned just at this point? Probably he was not born till several years after Noah and his family came forth from the ark, and probably also the eldest son of Shem was born before him, so that there appears no reason, at first sight, for this mention of Canaan. No doubt, however, he is introduced on account of his special connection with the incident which follows ; an incident which took place many years after his birth.

V. 19. *Three were these sons of Noah : and of these is the whole earth overspread.*

The statement is emphatic, these three were the *only* sons of Noah, and of them only was the whole world populated. This design of God was then just beginning to be carried out ; it has not been completed at any subsequent time, nor is it accomplished even at the present day. Whenever there is a rush to a new goldfield, whenever a tract of rich virgin land is discovered and begins to be occupied, these words are being fulfilled. We have here an instance of the use of the Hebrew perfect tense, to denote what is fixed and immutable in the purposes of God : so that the words may be translated with literal fidelity, *And of these is the whole earth to be overspread.**

We are to understand that there is a long interval between the time when Noah and his family left the

* These words seem to make it very improbable that any human beings remained alive after the Flood, except Noah and his family.

ark and what is next narrated. Noah was not much over six hundred years old when life upon the earth was re-commenced, and he lived nearly three hundred and fifty years longer. Why, then, were no more sons born to him? Evidently because it was the purpose of Almighty God that the three already enumerated should be the progenitors of the whole human race. How this was brought about we have no means of knowing: Noah's wife may have died shortly after the Flood, in which case there would be no one whom he could with any propriety take as a second wife; or it may be simply that his wife ceased to bear children, so that there was no further accession to his family. What then was it that occupied his attention during the remainder of his life?

V. 20. *And Noah, the tiller of the ground, commenced planting a vineyard.*

Here we learn quite incidentally that Noah had addicted himself to agricultural and horticultural pursuits. We have already assumed that he had taken with him in the ark all useful seeds, shoots and plants, that could be preserved—whether the vine was one of these it may be doubted. Unless then, it can exist, as the olive is said to do, for a long time under water, it may have been lost altogether in the region covered by the Flood. But even if this area was left bare of vegetation, the tremendous struggle for existence, which is ever going on among the various herbs, plants and trees, would very soon result in the vacant space being invaded by germs, seeds, and spores from the outlying country, and in a comparatively short time the soil would have been covered with a dense mass of vegetation. Among other things the trailing wild vine might be expected to thrust itself in; and with this Noah would have to start when he began to form his vineyard. It would require several years of careful cultivation in a soil well prepared and richly manured, before any grape was produced from which tolerable wine could be extracted; and all

this is concisely indicated by its being stated not that "Noah planted a vineyard," but that he *commenced planting a vineyard*.*

V. 21. *And he drank of the wine and was drunken ; and he was uncovered in the middle of his tent.*

The use of the word "tent" here does not necessarily imply that Noah and his family were actually living in tents, any more than the expression "tents of Shem," in verse 27, implies that the Semitic race would always be nomads dwelling in tents. The Hebrew word "ohel," meaning, properly, a tent or "tabernacle," is used to denote any kind of abode or habitation ; and it is probable that Noah and his family from the first constructed some kind of house, for the building of which the wood of the ark would afford them ample material.

We can easily imagine how Noah was led into this excess. It was probably nearly three hundred years since he had tasted wine, and he was now a very old man, whose brain was less able to bear the effects of it than he was himself at all aware. Most likely he was now trying for the first time the wine which he had succeeded in producing, and had no test of its alcoholic potency. He sat tasting it alone, before he offered it to any of his children, and found it palatable and pleasant. So he kept sipping it, till it began to effect his brain, and rendered him incapable of discerning when he ought to stop. At last he lay back on the divan on which he was sitting ; and by this time feeling flushed and heated, he unloosened the girdle of his flowing robes, scarcely conscious of what he

* It would be very interesting if, from the circumstances of the climate and the soil being suitable to the cultivation of the vine, we could form any idea of the region in which Noah and his descendants were living in that time. In western Asia the vine is cultivated up to over 5,000 feet above the level of the sea ; so that if Noah were then living somewhere to the south-west of Mount Ararat, in the mountainous district of Armenia, it would be easy for him to plant the vine, and make it flourish.

did. Finally, he fell into a drunken doze, and slipped off on to the floor, and in doing so let his garments fall asunder, and thus lay exposed. If he had been left alone for an hour or two he would have recovered himself, and no great harm would have happened, but, unfortunately some one came in.

V. 22. *And Ham, the father of Canaan, looked upon the nudity of his father, and told his two brethren without.*

It seems to us almost certain that there is a very slight mistake here in the text, which alters the whole sense. It has been mentioned, only four verses before, that Ham was the father of Canaan, and there seems no reason for the repetition of the statement at this point. But a very slight alteration in the Hebrew word used for “father of” would change it into the word for “with.” We think, therefore, that there can be little doubt that “with” was the original reading, and that by a mistake of a copyist at some very early period, which had been perpetuated ever since, it was changed to “father of.” The verse, then, ought to read,—

And Ham, with Canaan, looked upon the nudity of his father, and told his brethren without.

The father and son happened to pass the entrance of the room in which Noah was lying, and saw what had occurred; and instead of turning away at once, and saying as little as they could, they went in and gazed on Noah's exposure, and made ribald remarks to each other about him. Probably this was only the climax of a long course of disobedience and disrespect, in which Canan had been his father's companion and abettor. It seemed rare fun to these two, to whom Noah's saintliness had been a constant rebuke and offence, to find the aged saint in such a condition as this. We can imagine the wicked glee with which they went out, and told the two other sons of Noah what they had seen; and we can picture to ourselves the indignation and disgust with which these listened to

the recital. They immediately did what they could to remedy the matter.

V. 23. *And Shem and Japheth took the mantle and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nudity of their father ; and their faces were backward and they saw not their father's nudity.*

But what they did so reverently, led to very memorable consequences, for without that, what had happened might never have been known to Noah. Now, however, the narrative goes on,

V. 24. *And Noah awoke from his wine, and got to know what his son had done to him, the small one.*

The Hebrew word, "quaton" means first of all, "small in size," and secondly, "young in age"; and it has been generally taken in the latter sense here. But there appears no reason why Ham should be called the young son of Noah; as we have seen, he was almost certainly the second son, younger indeed as regards Shem, but older than Japheth. We think it likely, therefore, that the word means here that he was smaller in stature than his two brothers; and if it be asked why that fact is mentioned incidentally now,* the answer would seem to be, that as the three stood before him together, Noah was struck with the comparative insignificance of Ham, and noted that he who had done this mean act was a mean-looking person.†

* Compare the incidental mention of the fact that Noah was a "tiller of the ground" in verse 20.

† This surmise, which may have appeared fanciful at first, has been curiously corroborated by a discovery made since the passage was originally written. Not only did Ham become the father of a son who was called Canaan, probably because he was a puny, weakly child, but excavations which have been carried on at Gezer, near Jaffa, under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund, have proved that the earliest race which inhabited that district—who, if the record in Genesis x. 29 is authentic, must have been Canaanites, the offspring of Canaan—were an undersized puny tribe who, at a very early period,

As soon as Noah recovered his consciousness, he found himself lying on the floor, with a mantle which was not his own thrown over him. He would quickly begin to have some idea of what had occurred. Evidently someone had come in and thrown this garment over him. He summoned his three sons, and enquired what had happened. Probably they would all of them have gladly remained silent had he not insisted upon knowing the whole truth. As soon as his searching enquiries had elicited the fact that Canaan was the associate of his father in his evil-doing, no doubt he would summon him to hear what he had to say. The sentence which he pronounced was so unexpected and startling that it could only have been given under Divine guidance.

V. 25. *And he said, Cursed is Canaan ; a servant of servants shall he become unto his brethren.*

Several questions arise here at once. In the first place, why was the sentence pronounced on Canaan and not on Ham ? There seem to be two reasons for this. If the word had been, “Cursed be Ham,” it would be understood that the curse descended on his other sons—Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, as well as on Canaan.* And secondly, the punishment of Ham, personally, was perhaps almost as severe as it could be, when he heard this curse pronounced upon his first-born son. Probably the eldest son was his father’s favourite, his chosen companion in work and in recreation, and, alas ! his accomplice in all his delinquencies. Hence, the judgment pronounced on his son was the heaviest blow that could be struck to the father.

were subjugated by a more vigorous people. Thus there is no improbability in the supposition that their ancestor, Ham, was himself an insignificant-looking person.

* This shows how utterly baseless was the argument which used to be constantly employed to defend negro slavery. The negroes are the descendants of Cush, who was not cursed, and have nothing to do with Canaan, who was.

But it may be asked, was not the blow too severe on both father and son? No doubt it might seem so, if this last misdeed stood alone; but if it was only the last drop in the cup of iniquity, which had been filling for a long time, the case is quite altered. A bad father had begotten a bad son, and the evil would be perpetuated by hereditary descent in that line. And yet we must not suppose that the curse was transmitted to the descendants of Canaan with a pressure which could not be resisted by any free-will of their own. Their service to their brethren, which was, at any rate, part of the curse, might have been a blessing to themselves, and not have ended as it did, in the extermination which ultimately swept them from the face of the earth.* For as it is, the curse has worked so effectually through the ages, that while Canaan's brethren, Mizraim and Cush, are abundantly represented by races now existing, it does not appear that Canaan has a single descendant remaining, unless it can be found in a few persons having some Phœnician blood in them, among the lowest population in Malta.

Probably Noah's first intention was to stop with the sentence pronounced on Canaan, and he made a pause there; but a Divine impulse led him to speak again, and foretell the destiny of his two other sons.

V. 26. *And he said, Blessed is (Jehovah), the God of Shem;*

Let it be noticed here that no blessing is pronounced upon Shem himself; it is Jehovah who is blessed, in the thankfulness of Noah, that He will be specially the God of his eldest son, Shem. But whether this especial connection with the one true God would be a blessing to the Semites or a curse, must depend entirely upon their own use or neglect of it. Many and many a time has God visited them with all the heavier vengeance, because he is especially the God of Shem.

* See Appendix I, p. 228.

And Canaan shall become his servant.

This, too, was abundantly fulfilled. In very early times, of which we have no record, some nation of the Semitic race so effectually subjugated the Canaanites, and held them so long in subjection, that the Hamitic language, which must have originally been spoken by them, was lost, and replaced by the Semitic. Later on we know that the Israelities almost annihilated the different Canaanitish races, and kept those that were spared only to be *hewers of wood and drawers of water*. Later on, again, the Assyrians, who were Semites, subjugated or destroyed the great Hittite nation, who were the descendants of Heth, the son of Canaan.

V. 27. *God shall enlarge Japheth,*

Here for the first time a distinct blessing is pronounced ; the Japhetic race was to spread out far and wide over the earth. We need hardly point out how exactly this had been fulfilled. Of the four quarters of the world, Europe is occupied solely by the sons of Japheth, and America will be so ultimately. All northern Asia belongs to Russia, the people of which are sprung from Japheth, and in the southern parts, Persia and India, are in the main tenanted by the same race ; and lastly, we see the fulfilment of the prophecy going on before our own eyes, in the partitioning of the larger part of Africa among the European nations.

And he shall dwell in the tents of Shem ;

That is to say, the descendants of Japheth shall occupy countries which originally belonged to the Semites. Those countries were Palestine and Syria, Babylonia, Assyria, and a large portion of Arabia ; and after the fall of the Babylonish empire, which was Semitic, all these countries, with the exception of Arabia, began to be taken possession of by races sprung from Japheth ; the Persians, Greeks, and Romans conquered them successively. Whether the Semites are to

be left for ever in undisturbed possession of Arabia remains yet to be seen.

And Canaan shall become his servant.

The Phœnician settlements on the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean were most of them subjugated by the Japhetic races of the interior at a very early period; and the process was finally completed when the Romans destroyed the great city of Carthage, and reduced its inhabitants to slavery.

We think we may say, with some assurance, that this very late incident in the life of Noah, occurring, perhaps, when he was already 900 years old, could only have been recorded by Noah himself. Neither Ham, nor any descendant of Ham in later times, would have invented or cared to preserve a narrative so discreditable to their ancestor, and so ominous as regarded a portion of their race. On the other hand, neither Shem nor Japheth, nor any descendant of theirs would have invented the story of the stumbling of their great forefather. And the "Jehovist" who, according to the modern critics, fabricated this paragraph of the Book of Genesis in the reign of Jehoshaphat, must have been indeed a remarkable man, if he were able to invent this wonderful prophecy of Noah, so far-reaching in its terseness, so accurate in its forecast.

From this and many other particulars of the narrative contained in the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th chapters of the Book of Genesis, we can come to no other conclusion than that Noah himself compiled it. It is evidently the work of one who was a contemporary and eye-witness of the facts which he recorded. If so, we have here a document which, with the exception of the Adamic record preceding it, is the very oldest in the world.

V. 28. *And Noah lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years.*

Observe here that the words, *and begat sons and daughters*, which are inserted in the case of each of the other Patriarchs, are in this instance markedly omitted.

Noah had no sons or daughters but those who passed with him through the great catastrophe of the Flood.

V. 29. *And all the days of Noah amounted to nine hundred and fifty years, and he died.*

So passed away the last and greatest of the primeval Patriarchs. Probably no man ever had or ever will have such a stupendous work assigned to him, as that which he successfully accomplished. To gather together all that was worth preserving out of the civilization of a world that had become utterly corrupt ; to rear a family who should, in a great measure, escape the gross pollution, in the midst of which they had to be brought up ; to collect the plants and animals by which the earth might be re-stocked ; to provide the means by which all these might pass in safety through the flood of waters ; and finally to lay the foundations of social life and political institutions for a race making a fresh start, must have required a combination of genius, forethought, practical energy, patience and courage, such as it is impossible to over-estimate. When we add to this, that, according to the testimony of God Himself, Noah was *righteous before Him*, and perfect in his conduct towards his contemporaries, and that, when he offended on one occasion, he had the courage and humility to make what reparation he could and render his falling a warning to all future generations, by recording it with unflinching plainness, and without palliation or excuse ; we feel that Noah must have been, not merely a great genius, but, what was far better, one of the very greatest saints that ever lived.

The last two verses of this chapter were, no doubt, written by Shem, into whose hands, together with the other sacred memorials, the Noachic record passed at Noah's death.*

* See Appendix K, p. 229.

CHRONOLOGY.

OF THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE DEATH OF ADAM
AND THE DEATH OF NOAH.

A.M.

- 1,000 (cir) Introduction of Idolatry.
1,122 Birth of Enoch
1,200 (cir) Incursion of the Angels.
1,287 Birth of Methuselah.
1,487 Translation of Enoch.
1,474 Birth of Lamech.
1,662 Birth of Noah.
2,142 First Announcement of the coming Destruction.
2,164 Birth of Shem.
2,174 (cir) Birth of Ham.
2,182 (cir) Directions given to Noah to Prepare an Ark.
2,184 (cir) Birth of Japheth.
2,227 Death of Lamech.
2,256 Death of Methuselah.
2,262 Commencement of the Deluge.
2,263 Termination of the Deluge.
2,265 The Birth of Shem's First Son, Arpachshad.
2,275 (cir) Birth of Ham's First Son, Canaan.
2,560 (cir) Noah's Prophecy of the Destinies of his Children.
2,612 Death of Noah.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX E.

(See p. 161.)

There can be no doubt that transposition has played an important part in producing the text of Holy Scripture as we now have it. The copyist would inadvertently pass over a sentence or passage and go on to that which followed it. If he discovered his mistake, he would not think it necessary to strike out what he had written, but would insert after it what ought to have been written before, making some kind of mark, or note to show that it was to be read before the passage preceding it. The next transcriber would not have noticed, or not understood, the note of his predecessor, but would simply copy the manuscript as it now stood ; and thus the error would get into all the succeeding copies. Perhaps the most striking instance of this transposition occurs in the beginning of the 1st chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy. There we read, *These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Suph, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab.* Now the words of Moses were spoken unto all Israel beyond Jordan, as we read a little further on, in the country of Moab, which is not near Paran or Hazeroth, nor presumably any of those places which have just been mentioned. How are we to account for this obvious inconsistency which thus faces us in the 1st verse of this book ? The answer is that the words *over against Suph* down to *unto Kadesh-Barnea* have got out of their place ; they should come in the 6th verse, after the word

"Horeb," as a parenthesis explaining the position of the Israelitish camp before they began their march from Horeb to Kadesh-Barnea.

The passage should stand thus :—

These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan, in the wilderness, in the Arabah.

And it came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month, that Moses spake unto the children of Israel, Beyond Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law, saying, The Lord our God spake unto us in Horeb,—over against Suph, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab, (it is eleven days from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-Barnea)—saying, Ye have dwelt long enough in this mountain.

And it is well worthy of notice that this error is a very ancient one, for the text not only of the Septuagint but also of the Samaritan version, is the same as that of the Hebrew ; so that we may feel sure that this mistake was already in the manuscripts more than 400 B.C. Such an instance as this shows that there is no improbability in the supposition that a similar transposition has taken place with regard to the 3rd verse of the 6th chapter of Genesis.

APPENDIX F. (See pp. 179, 191.)

It would be extremely interesting if a probable estimate could be made of the number of persons who perished in the Flood ; but the insufficiency of the data renders the attempt very difficult, and any results that may be arrived at very precarious. If we could set down so many generations as having occurred between Adam and the Flood, and determine with reasonable accuracy the number of children of which each human couple were the parents, the

calculation would be easy enough ; but there is want of definiteness as to both these points. Let us take the latter first. According to the reckoning of the Septuagint, Seth, the third son of Adam, was born when the latter was 230 years old. We have supposed that 105 years of that time elapsed before the birth of his first son ; so that we may have 125 years left for the birth of three sons. We may assume that a daughter was born between each pair of sons, so that we have altogether, five children born in 125 years : that is to say 25 years on an average occurred between the birth of every two successive children. Now if we take the average of the lives of nine Patriarchs before the Flood, omitting Enoch, whose life was exceptionally short, we find that the length of life is almost exactly 910 years. Again, if we take the average of the date of the birth of the first child of each Patriarch, omitting that of Adam's first son, because it was exceptionally short, and Seth's and Noah's, because they were exceptionally long, we find that for the remaining seven Patriarchs, the average of the age of the father at the time of the birth of the eldest son was 175 years ; or, in other words, that the interval between the birth of every two successive first sons was 175 years. If then, we divide 2,262 years—the date of the Flood—by 175, we get the number of generations before the Flood, reckoning them by the first-born sons ; and we find it to be almost exactly thirteen generations.

Then, taking as we have said, 910 years as the length of life, and subtracting from this 175 for the birth of a first child, we have 735 years as a time during which children might be born. But probably for the last eighty-five years of this time the Patriarch would be too old to have children born to him, so that there would remain 650 years for the birth of the Patriarch's family. Since, then, we have supposed that twenty-five years elapsed between every two successive births, the average family would consist of twenty-six children ; or supposing that there were an

equal number of males and females, there would in due time arrive thirteen pairs. But in a family of twenty-six children, there would be pretty sure to be some casualties, and to simplify the calculation, we may suppose that there were six children, who either did not survive to the age of maturity, or were childless, or did not produce any children who lived long enough to be added to the next generation. In that case we should have ten pairs springing from each single couple.

Since we have supposed no children to be born in the last eighty-five years of a Patriarch's life, subtracting eighty-five from 910, the average length of life, we get the 825th year of the Patriarch's life for the birth of the last child, and consequently, 825 years between the birth of one youngest child, and the birth of his youngest child. Therefore, in the case of the youngest sons of youngest sons, a generation must be reckoned at 825 years. And since the time from the birth of Adam to the Flood is 2,262 years, we shall find that the number of these generations is almost exactly two-and-three-quarters, which for the purposes of this calculation, we may reckon as three. We found before, that the generations reckoned by eldest sons were thirteen, if then we take the mean between these two extremes, we arrive at eight generations as a sufficiently probable number for the basis of our calculation.

On this supposition, the first generation after Adam would consist of ten pairs, and to find the number of pairs in the succeeding generations, we must keep on multiplying the number in each generation by ten till we arrive at the eighth generation, reckoning the children of Adam himself as the first. We shall find that this gives us for the last generation 100,000,000 pairs. It might seem that we ought to add to these all the preceding generations, making the sum III,III,III . But the addition made by the eight final units is so small in comparison with the 100,000,000, that it may be neglected, or taken to represent the number of those

who perished before the Flood from old age, accident, or in a far greater degree, from the wars and deeds of violence which prevailed during the later ages of terrible lust and cruelty. On the whole, then, we shall probably be under rather than over the mark, if we estimate the number of those who perished in the Flood at 100,000,000 of pairs, making the enormous sum of 200,000,000 individuals.

The present population of the earth is roughly estimated at 1,600,000,000, so that the number of persons alive on the earth at the time of the Flood, would be about an eighth part of those now living. Such a population must have covered a large area ; but if we take an oval of which the major axis extends from a point in the Atlantic, a little to the west of the north of Scotland, to the Indian Ocean, at a point a little to the west of Cape Comorin, having Mount Ararat as a centre, and with a minor axis sufficiently long to make the oval include the greater part of the coast of the Mediterranean Sea ; and if we suppose that oval to represent the area of depression ; we shall get quite enough space to include all of the human race whom we are supposing to have been alive at the time of the Deluge.*

APPENDIX G. (See p. 193.)

Mr. Thomson, the head keeper at the Zoological Society's Gardens, Regent's Park, informs me that they employ there about fifty keepers and assistant keepers. The keepers attend to the animals only till eleven o'clock a.m., being required after that to be on duty while visitors are in the gardens ; so that, probably, we should be safe in saying that forty keepers would be sufficient merely to attend to the cleaning and feeding of the animals. But of these

* The inhabitants of British India at the present time are reckoned at 230,000,000 ; so it is easy to see that 200,000,000 persons might be destroyed by the submergence of only a portion of the earth's surface.

only the mammals and birds would require much special attention, of which together there are 2,446 species ; so that it appears each keeper can very well attend to sixty species of animals. From this it will be seen that Noah's three sons and their wives could minister to the wants of 210 species, which we have calculated to have been about the number taken in the ark. Each man and wife would thus have seventy species to look after.

APPENDIX H. (See p. 195.)

We have here followed the reading of the Septuagint and the Vulgate ; the Hebrew text as we now have it gives *on the seventeenth day of the month*. Now as the Flood began in the second month of the year, on the seventeenth day of the month, the interval between that and the seventeenth day of the seventh month would be exactly five months of thirty days each, or 150 days, which is the time at the end of which the waters began to decrease. But it is clear that the ark must have been at first some little way above the ground, so that it could not rest on the mountains of Ararat until the waters had flowed away for several days. Therefore, the reading which we have adopted, allowing for ten days between the commencement of the ebb and the resting of the Ark, is almost certainly the correct one.

APPENDIX I. (See p. 218.)

We have an instance in the case of Levi, of a condition which was the result of a curse being turned into a blessing. In the 49th chapter of Genesis, verse 7, Jacob speaks thus of Simeon and Levi, "Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce ; and their wrath for it was cruel : I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel."

As far as Simeon was concerned, this denunciation was fulfilled so literally that we scarcely hear anything of them from the time when they were settled in the Holy Land. But the Levites stood firm when the rest of the people fell into idolatry at Mount Sinai. All the sons of Levi ranged themselves with Moses, and executed at his bidding the fierce anger of the Lord. And, therefore, as had been foretold, they were scattered in Israel, when the people settled in the Holy Land, yet it was that they might be the chosen servants of the Lord, to teach His law to their brethren.

APPENDIX K. (See p. 193.)

ON TRADITIONS OF ANTEDILUVIAN TIMES,
AND OF THE DELUGE, OTHER THAN THE ACCOUNTS CONTAINED
IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

If Genesis is an authentic record—if, that is, the events recorded in it did actually occur—it would be not impossible that some far-off echoes of them might be handed down by memory to later times. Again, if the earlier chapters of Genesis are a contemporaneous record, the narratives of which were written down as soon as the earliest mode of writing was invented, this document must have been in the hands of the progenitors of mankind. And although copies would be produced, probably with great difficulty at first, we may be sure that when the human race separated originally and set off to seek new homes, each division as it started took with it one or more copies of the sacred narrative. Hence there must have been at first, to reinforce the memories, and hand them down from father to son, these written documents containing the essential particulars; which might be referred to, and which probably would be read aloud on certain solemn occasions. Yet it is quite clear that in most of the races of

men who sprang from Noah, these authentic records were lost at a very early period, and that of them, as of the events which they recorded, there remained only memories which became more and more vague and more and more mythical.

But how came the sacred documents to be thus lost ? We think that there can be but one answer to this question. The records of Genesis contain the revelation of a God, so righteous, so holy, so mighty, and so terrible in His hatred of evil, that men did not like to retain Him in their knowledge, to allow their thoughts to dwell upon Him, and to give Him the worship due to His Majesty. That took place with regard to the race which is ever being repeated in the individual. When temptation to a pleasant sin occurs, the thought that it is displeasing to God arises in the mind. Then comes the trial of man's free-will—either he retains the thought of God, and the grace of God keeps him from the sin, or else he puts the thought of God out of his mind, and plunges into the transgression. If this departure from God is continually repeated, the belief in Him becomes more and more vague and shadowy, and being associated with the idea of retribution, is kept as far as possible in the background. Then private devotion is given up, and any book or document purporting to be a revelation of God is laid aside and never consulted. And so the man gives himself up entirely to secular pursuits and pleasures, and becomes to all intents and purposes an idolater, *worshipping and serving the creature rather than the Creator*. A similar decadence went on gradually in almost every portion of the human race ; no doubt there were many counteracting influences, but on the whole, men did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and gradually sank into a condition in which *they glorified him not as God neither gave thanks*. So the sacred records which reminded them of Him were no longer read, were thrown aside, and ceased to be perpetuated by fresh copies. Still there

would remain a dim traditional recollection of what they contained which would very soon become mixed with a quantity of legendary and mythical matter, distorting and falsifying it in many strange ways.

Let us then see what we can glean by comparing the record of Genesis with traditions still remaining of the same events.

When we have grasped the idea that Adam must have been taken away and educated by angelic beings, apart from his animal progenitors, we can hardly avoid being struck with the resemblance to this contained in the legend that Zeus was brought up on Mount Ida in the Island of Crete by the mystic Corybantes, to save him from his father Kronos. And being led by this to see whether any other resemblances can be found between Zeus and Adam, we come at once upon the story that Athene sprang from the head of Zeus, somewhat in the same way as Eve was taken from Adam's side. When we add to this that Zeus is continually spoken of as the father of mankind, we seem to have good reason to suppose that though originally his name merely denoted "the sky," yet a shadowy recollection of the first man in some way became attached to it ; so that we have the record of some of the very earliest events reproduced in this distorted form.

The various legends of Creation are so mythical and monstrous, that we do not think anything can be learnt from a comparison of them with the record contained in Genesis. A word or phrase appears here and there, which may remind us of a similar phrase in Genesis, but this is only what would be likely to occur in any attempt to account for the beginning of things. The resemblances which are found between the Biblical narrative and the account of Creation given in the Babylonian Tablets are very vague, and hardly worthy of notice considering the absurdity and monstrosity of the Babylonian legend. Still, if the memory has been preserved in the latter—

which seems doubtful—of the work having been divided between six days, followed by a day of rest, and even if it could be shown that the work of each day corresponded with the description of it given in the 1st chapter of Genesis, there would be nothing remarkable in this, but only what might be expected if the ancestors of the Accadians, equally with those of the Israelites, originally had the Biblical document in their possession.

Of the Fall there appears to be one solitary indication, in a Babylonian representation of a man and woman seated on either side of a tree with a serpent erect behind the man :* but this may have been drawn after the Jews had been carried captive to Babylon, taking with them the Scriptural record of the Fall.

The account of the Angels having left their heavenly home to cohabit with mortal women seems to have left a far deeper impress. Again and again we read in the classic authors of Gods coming down to form unions with the daughters of men. Generally indeed these connections are represented as being of a transitory nature, but there are one or two instances of Gods taking up their abode upon earth for some years.

To the reality of the Deluge, we have a much more widespread testimony. Mixed up with much that is mythical and grotesque, we find in distant parts of the world a tradition of there having been once a Flood of Waters which destroyed the human race, through which a person or persons were preserved, who, on account of being for some reason the favourites of heaven, received a Divine intimation of what was about to occur. Through this they were enabled to construct some kind of vessel in which they passed safely through the Deluge, and became the means by which the earth was re-populated. The fact that this tradition has been entirely lost in some lands is no proof at all that it did not originally exist among the races

* See Lang's "Human Origins," p. 103.

inhabiting those countries : for tradition is always liable to die out. But on the other hand, the fact that it is still found in countries, and among races, that are far apart from one another, does seem to be a fair proof that some such event actually occurred at a very early period ; and not only so, but that those who have retained even the most shadowy memory of it, must have sprung from the survivors of the catastrophe.

But the clearest tradition of the event is found where we should expect to find it, viz., in the country where those who went through the Flood afterwards resided ; that is in Assyria and Babylonia. First we have the strange story of the half-human, half-fish monster Oannes, who arose from the waters at the head of the Persian Gulf, and brought with him the knowledge of writing and all the useful arts. If, as we have endeavoured to show, man, when expelled from Paradise, was settled first of all in the region at the head of the Persian Gulf, and there, as the Biblical narrative implies, invented the most necessary arts and appliances ; and if this region was submerged in the Flood, and remained for a long time afterwards a part of the sea ; and if all needful art and knowledge was preserved in the ark for the use of the survivors and their descendants who came forth and settled in a more northern region, we seem to have all the materials necessary for the fabrication of the strange myth just described. The monster would be a dim imagination of the monstrous ark ; and the name " Oannes," which has never yet been satisfactorily explained, may possibly be simply a distorted form of " Noah." *

The Babylonian legend of the Flood is given in a poem describing the adventures and exploits of a mythical hero, whose name is differently rendered as Gilgames or Gisdhubar. This personage has been identified by some writers, much too confidently as it seems to us, with the Nimrod of Genesis.

* The process of transformation would be, " Noach," " Oanch," " Oannes."

Both probably were kings, and each was a great hunter ; but that, any early king in those regions was pretty certain to be. Round the name of this hero some Babylonian or Assyrian poet appears to have gathered a number of stories which were extant in his day ; much as the writer of the *Odyssey* made Ulysses the centre of various fabulous narratives which existed among his people in his time. Fortunately the Chaldean Epic is arranged on an Astronomical principle so that it is possible, from the position which it implies of the sun with regard to certain constellations, to fix a date before which the poem could not have been composed. We are therefore able to say pretty confidently that it must have been written between 3,000 and 2,500 years B.C.. This would be at least 3,000 years after the Deluge took place ; so that we can well imagine how fabulous and mythical under ordinary circumstances the record of the Flood would have become by that time. Moreover from the fact that the story is related to Gilgames by word of mouth we may assume that the poet had no written document to rely upon, but merely collected what he could from traditions handed down from father to son. Hence we may infer that the authentic record of the event which his remote ancestors had once possessed, had long since been thrown aside, been neglected to be copied, and had finally been lost ; though as we shall see, there are certain passages in the poem which would seem to have been derived from a memory of that record.

The name of the person who is represented as giving this narrative to Gilgames is rendered in different copies, and according to different interpreters, in several forms. Probably all these were varied epithets given to him in after times when the real name had been lost. We will call him Sisuthros, which is the Greek form of the name, supposed to have been derived from a Chaldean word, signifying " very shrewd." Other names are translated " sun of life," " saved," " pious," the first of which may perhaps denote

that it was he who was the means of preserving life upon the earth, as the sun does by its heat. Sisuthros then, who occupies in the story the place of the Biblical Noah, and gives an account of the Deluge to Gilgames is stated to have been the ruler of a district somewhere on the lower part of the Euphrates. It is not impossible that tradition has here preserved a fact : Noah could hardly have done what he is related in Genesis to have accomplished unless he had been a powerful ruler ; though he himself, characteristically, makes no mention of the circumstance. That Sisuthros was a righteous man can only be inferred from the story, for there seems to be no express statement to that effect. As to the wickedness of the rest of the human race, it is described, apparently, as consisting in their having ceased to offer sacrifices to the gods, which was probably a true tradition. But the profound impression of bloodshed, cruelty, lust, and utter corruption, which the Biblical record produces by a few touches, is entirely lost. Moreover the moral effect of the narrative is done away with in the Chaldean account, by the fact that a council of the chief gods—of whom Bel, the god of the earth and of war was the most wrathful, and was entrusted with the carrying out of their fell purpose—intended to destroy Sisuthros as well as the rest of mankind, and that he was only saved through the artifice of one of their number who favoured him.

This was Ea, the god of wisdom, who dreading the vengeance of the others if he disclosed their secret determination, whispered to the sighing reeds a message, which they communicated to Sisuthros by their rustling. He repeated the warning to the people, but they refused to believe it, and turned it into ridicule. Here probably tradition has preserved the truth. Sisuthros prepared a vessel in which he and his might be saved from destruction. The only particular in which the description of this vessel agrees with the Biblical account is that it was caulked with

pitch and bitumen. The special mention of this circumstance, which seems hardly likely to have been handed down for any very long time by mere tradition, appears to show that some document containing the Biblical narrative had really preserved it during many generations, though that document had been lost before the poet's time : but certainly all the rest that he tells about the vessel was imaginary. The deck of the vessel was apparently as broad as it was long, it had a pilot and tackling, which implies a rudder and sails, and it seems to have been launched into the sea. Then the process of embarkation began ; here again, the description by a true tradition, agrees with the Scriptural narrative, in stating *that the beasts of the field, and the wild beasts of the field, and the seed of life of every kind* were made to go up into the ship. Other particulars are given, which, though not derived from the record in Genesis, are likely to be true. Sisuthros is represented as putting all his valuables, and all his movable property on board. But, in addition to himself and his family, he is stated to have taken with him all his slaves, and, according to one interpretation, all his harem ; a statement which the imagination of the writer would be almost certain to supply. The catastrophe is represented as having begun with a tremendous tempest ; here again tradition seems to preserve a fact, and the circumstance of utter darkness, which is implied, but not expressly mentioned, in the Biblical narrative, is here particularly described : *all that was light was turned to darkness ; brother no longer beheld brother, men recognized each other no more.* Then rushed in the Deluge from the sea, rising rapidly higher and higher, and destroying the whole human race, who are related to have *encumbered the sea like the spawn of fish*. As to the duration of the catastrophe, tradition failed, and the writer had again to trust to his own idea of what was probable. Judging therefore that a week would amply suffice for the destruction of every living thing in

such a cataclysm, he states that on the seventh day *the sea became calm, and the storm and Flood stopped.*

Twelve days later, apparently, the vessel grounded on what is described as a mountain, in the land of Nisar, which appears to be the country between the Tigris and the Great Zab ; and the Judi mountains seem to be the range on which the vessel rested. These might very well be the " mountains of Ararat " of the Biblical narrative, so that here we have probably a true tradition. Then follows an incident which is almost certainly a reminiscence which has been preserved by a written document, some memories of which had come down to the time of the poet. Sisuthros " took out a dove and let it go ; the dove went, turned about, and as there was no place to alight upon, came back." Then comes something which has been introduced by the imagination of the poet or his predecessors. Sisuthros "took out a swallow and let it go : the swallow went, turned him about, and as there was no place to alight upon, came back." The swallow may have been a sacred or favourite bird among the ancient Babylonians, and been introduced into the narrative on that account. This then goes on to describe how Sisuthros " took out a raven and let it go ; the raven went and saw that the water had abated, and came near to the ship, flapping its wings, croaking, and returned no more." The account then describes how Sisuthros, having sent forth the inhabitants of the vessel, offered a great sacrifice. So far the poet follows a true tradition ; for the sacrifice of Noah, rendered memorable as it was by the blessing and promise which it drew down, was a fact which would be almost sure to be preserved in a popular tradition. But here again the solemnity and moral impressiveness of the authentic record is destroyed by mythological accretions. The gods, who had long been deprived of their accustomed offerings, quickly snuffed up " the excellent odour, and gathered like flies above the offering." But Bel, who had hitherto

been unconscious of what had occurred, when he drew near with the rest, was filled with rage at then discovering for the first time that there were some persons who had survived that destruction in which he had intended to overwhelm all things living. So mighty was he, that even the great gods cowered before his wrath. But the wise Ea made a speech in which he defended himself and the others ; and so successfully did he plead, that Bel was mollified. Taking Sisuthros and his wife by the hand, and placing himself between them, Bel said, "Henceforward let Sisuthros and his wife be revered like the gods, and let them dwell afar off at the mouth of the rivers ; and he carried them away and settled them afar off at the mouth of the rivers." This placing of the Paradise to which Sisuthros and his wife are translated at the top of the Persian Gulf, where the rivers Tigris and Euphrates flow into it, is well worthy of note. If the original Paradise had been, as we have endeavoured to show, at the top of the Persian Gulf, and if, although the site of it had afterwards, as we have supposed, been covered by the sea, the memory of its true locality had been preserved by tradition, we can see at once why immortalized human beings would be translated to a Paradise in this region.

After the comparison which we have made between the Biblical record and the mythological legends of the Deluge, we think it must appear wonderful that any one with any literary tact could ever suppose that the former was derived from the latter. It would be a curious and interesting experiment to lay before an intelligent literary man, who had never heard of the account of the Flood given in Genesis,—if such a person could be found—the grotesque narrative of the Babylonian legend, and ask him to reconstruct the story upon the lines of monotheism and morality. We should very much like to see what he would make of it !

APPENDIX L. (See Preface II., p. vii.)

ON THE SUPPOSED IMPOSSIBILITY OF RECONCILING THE
DIVERSITY OF HUMAN RACES AND LANGUAGES NOW EXISTING
WITH THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVE.

The higher critics reject the statement that the descendants of Noah peopled the whole earth, as being irreconcilable with what we now know about the different races of mankind ; and Dr. Driver fully sets forth their objections.* So far as these objections depend upon the lateness of the date given in the Hebrew text for the dispersion of mankind, they fall to the ground if, as we have endeavoured to show, there is an error in the chronology of that text, amounting to several hundred years, between the Deluge and the Dispersion, and again a much larger one, of about three thousand years, between the date of the Dispersion and that of the birth of Abram. But it is clear that the objections of the critics go far beyond that. Following the present trend of popular scientific belief, they assert that the differences of bodily structure, colour of the skin, composition, colour, and arrangement, of the hair, as well as of character and mental capacities, are greater than could have arisen between now and the earliest time to which either the date of Noah, or that of Adam, can be assigned according to the narrative of Genesis. Now on this point, as far as we can see at present, there appears to be an irreconcilable difference between the statements of the Book of Genesis and those of the scientists to whom the critics appeal. The former represents children of the same parents as being so different from each other that they become almost immediately progenitors of different races. We have the case of the three sons of Noah originating three distinct divisions of mankind ; of Ishmael and Isaac, both sons of Abram, giving rise to very different tribes ; and of the two nations of

* Driver's "Genesis," pp. xxxi. to xxxvii.

Moab and Ammon, who, although they sprang from the union of persons who were most closely akin, developed separate racial distinctions which they maintained throughout the whole of their existence.

The question is, can science not merely assert, but prove that such congenital differences are impossible? Even now there is an extraordinary variety of bodily appearance, character, and mental qualities shown in children of the same parents; is it not worth the consideration of scientific men whether there may not have been causes in primitive times which greatly accentuated, and tended to perpetuate, such differences? There have been already several warnings to them, and to those who rely upon their authority, not to be too confident with respect to measures of time. Soon after Darwin's views were first published, Professor Huxley drew attention to the fact that when changes took place in bodily structure, they often did not arise by the gradual aggregation of small variations, but started into existence fully developed. He instanced the case of a child born with a thumb and five fingers; a peculiarity which was reproduced in some of his descendants for several generations. It is evident then that if such considerable bodily variations can arise at once, those requisite to form a new race might take place in a very moderate space of time.

But a much more important check was given to those who postulated immense periods for the production of changes in bodily structure,—asserting that at least a hundred million years would be necessary in order to bring animal life to its present condition,—by the investigations of Lord Kelvin in regard to the rate with which the earth has parted with its heat. His calculations, founded upon very careful experiments, led him to declare with confidence, that the existence of life, vegetable or animal, on this earth, was impossible beyond a limit lying between twenty million and thirty million years ago; and this calculation has

never been disproved. Surely, having once made a mistake of say seventy-five million years, naturalists, and those who argue from their assumptions, may fairly be asked to show a little consideration and diffidence in their requirements of time.

Still, the objectors may fairly say that the sudden production of a new race has never occurred, as far as we know, in historic times, and that therefore we are entitled to assume that it never did occur. Surely it would be sufficient to reply to this that the Almighty, having designed to form a certain number of distinct races, would arrange that their production should cease when the number was complete. But science, too, has something to say on this point which is well worth the consideration of the critics. As no new race has been produced, so no new species has appeared within the limits of time comprised by scientific observation. Yet as there are many races of mankind, and many species of animals, existing, there must have been times when these first arose, and we can only ascertain when and how they occurred by looking back as far as we can into the past. Now as regards the races of mankind, if scientific men will not accept the statements of Genesis, at any rate as a working hypothesis, they have no facts whatever to start with ; but it may be possible to learn something by analogy from the rise of species of animals as exhibited in the earth's strata, and for this we must go to the researches of the scientific palæontologists. The conclusions to which these have gradually arrived by long-continued and painstaking investigation are sufficiently remarkable : as bearing upon the matter we are considering, they may be summed up as follows :—

1. Although in some cases a line of gradual development may be traced by which in the course of long periods one species may be fairly supposed to have arisen from another by gradual modifications, yet that is not invariably, nor ordinarily, what occurs.

Generally a particular type goes on for ages with little or no modification in its structure, and then suddenly a new form or species leaps into existence without any connecting link whatever. Now in these instances, if we believe in evolution at all, we must suppose that a creature of the original type gave birth to something approaching the new form, which by further modification in one or two more generations produced the fresh species. But, if this was so in the case of the origin of species among animals, how much more possible must it be for all the tribes and races of the human family,—the most separated of which only differ from each other as varieties and not distinct species,—to have sprung from the original type in the same way.

2. It is found that when a new form was thus produced, it for some time showed a liability to vary still further, but after a while settled down as it were and became the source of one or more fresh permanent species. *

There is nothing then contrary to the teaching of science in the belief that Noah gave birth to sons who were remarkably different from each other, and in whose offspring the same instability for a time continued, until all the principal races of the earth were produced as they have existed down to the present time : and again that some six thousand years afterwards another critical period occurred in the family of Abraham and his near kinsmen, on a lesser scale, but still sufficient to produce several distinct races.

Closely connected with that of races is the question of the common origin of languages. And here let us recall to the memory of the Higher Critics a warning which was given most emphatically by the great Sanskrit scholar, the late Professor Max Müller, nearly 40 years ago.

“If you wish to assert that language had various

* See the Contemporary Review for July, 1902, Art., “What about Natural Selection ?” pp. 86—88.

beginnings, you must prove it impossible that language could have had a common origin." *

A warning which has been driven home since that time by a remarkable linguistic discovery. In Max Müller's day Chinese was supposed to be the simplest and earliest form of language, having no grammar and consisting of original monosyllabic roots, which had never coalesced, and were merely strung together to express different ideas. But within the last few years French philologists have shown that Chinese was once polysyllabic like most other languages, and has been reduced to what it is by a process of wear and tear. This tongue, which was supposed to be so ancient that it must have originated myriads of years ago and so unique that it had no relations with the great Turanian group of languages to which it is found in close proximity, is now generally allowed to have sprung from the ancient language of Babylonia, the Accadian; a speech highly developed, having complex grammatical forms, which Chinese in its present condition seems to have entirely lost. The people who speak this language began to enter the region which they at present occupy about the year 2,200 B.C., and allowing more than a thousand years for them to have traversed the continent of Asia, making many settlements, and many migrations, we may suppose them to have started from Babylonia about B.C. 3,500. Here then we have the case of what appears to be an entirely new language of the simplest construction, with the most marked peculiarities, growing up and attaining its present form in about two thousand years. And what makes this lesson the more impressive is the fact that this new language took its origin from the very country where the eleventh chapter of Genesis relates the separation of different forms of speech from one

* Lectures on "The Science of Language," 5th Edition, 1866, p. 369.

original language to have occurred. Is it not wonderful that after such a warning eminent scholars should persist in making the extreme variety and diversity of language a reason for treating the Biblical narrative as a mere legend unworthy of their attention ? *

* See Driver's "Genesis" p. xxxv.

DATE DUE

OCT 0 4 1989		OCT 2 1 1997	
OCT 2 7 1989			
	OCT 2 7 1989		
FEB 1 5 1991	OCT 0 5 1998		
MAR 0 8 1991	SEP 2 4 1998		
MAR 0 1 1991	FEB 2 4 1999		
OCT 2 0 1992	DEC 1 4 1999		
NOV 2 1992			
	JUN 1 7 2005		
	JUL 1 3 2005		
	AUG 2 5 2005		
	AUG 0 3 2005		
DEC 0 1 1992			
DEC 0 1 1992			
MAR 1 6 1994			
MAR 1 7 1994			



3 1197 00332 5252

